00064336

O
7241
Blo/His
64336

BOMBAY BRANCH
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY.

Digitized with financial assistance from
Observer Research Foundation
on 22 February, 2019

To R. A. S. Bombay Br.

Talwalkar

Vasudeo Ramchandra Talwalkar

A HISTORY OF
RENAISSANCE ARCHITECTURE
IN ENGLAND, 1500—1800

LONDON: YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN
NEW YORK: 66, FIFTH AVENUE, AND
BOMBAY: 53, ESPLANADE ROAD
CAMBRIDGE: DEIGHTON, BELL AND CO.

A HISTORY OF RENAISSANCE ARCHITECTURE

IN ENGLAND, 1500–1800

BY REGINALD BLOMFIELD, M.A.
EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD, ARCHITECT.
AUTHOR OF "THE FORMAL GARDEN IN ENGLAND." WITH DRAWINGS BY THE AUTHOR AND OTHER ILLUSTRATIONS

64336
a c

VOL. II

LONDON
GEORGE BELL AND SONS
1897

724.1
Blo/His
64336

CHISWICK PRESS:—CHARLES WHITTINGHAM AND CO.
TOOKS COURT, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.

CHAPTER		PAGE
VIII.	WREN'S CONTEMPORARIES AND SUCCESSORS: JARMAN, WYNNE, BELL OF LYNN, TALMAN, VANBRUGH, HAWKSMOOR.—ALDRICH, CLARK, BURROUGH, ESSEX	187
IX.	THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY ARCHITECTS: ARCHER, JAMES, CAMPBELL, RIPLEY, LORD BURLINGTON, LEONI, KENT .	213
X.	GIBBS, WARE, FLITCROFT, VARDY, THE WOODS OF BATH, DANCE THE ELDER	233
XI.	PAINE, MORRIS, TAYLOR, CARR OF YORK, CHAMBERS, GANDON, DANCE THE YOUNGER, ROBERT AND JAMES ADAM . .	254
XII.	HOUSE PLANNING IN THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES	276
XIII.	ARCHITECTURAL LITERATURE IN THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES	302
XIV.	THE TRADES: CARPENTRY, MASONRY	320
XV.	BRICKWORK, PLASTER WORK, LEAD, AND IRON . . .	348
XVI.	CONCLUSION	393

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

	PAGE
PIER, HAMPSTEAD MARSHALL	189
PLAN OF NEWCASTLE HOUSE. (ALL SOULS' COLLECTION.)	191
DOORWAY IN QUEEN STREET, KING'S LYNN	193
NORTH RUNCTON CHURCH, NORFOLK	195
CHRIST CHURCH, SPITALFIELDS	201
PLAN OF CHRIST CHURCH, SPITALFIELDS	203
ENTRANCE TO QUEEN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD	205
A PLAN AMONGST WREN'S DRAWINGS. ALL SOULS' COLLECTION (POSSIBLY BY HAWKSMOOR).	207
ALL SAINTS, OXFORD	209
THE TOWER OF ST. PHILIP'S, BIRMINGHAM	215
WANSTEAD IN ESSEX. (FROM "VITRUVIUS BRITANNICUS," I. 23.)	219
WREN'S DESIGN FOR THE NEW DORMITORY, WESTMINSTER. (ALL SOULS' COLLECTION.)	227
ST. MARY-LE-STRAND	235
DETAIL OF THE WEST END OF ST. MARTIN'S-IN-THE-FIELDS	237
GROUND PLAN OF CHESTERFIELD HOUSE. (FROM WARE'S "ARCHITECTURE.")	245
ST. LEONARD'S, SHOREDITCH	253
GROUND PLAN OF GOSFORTH HOUSE. (FROM J. PAINE'S "PLANS, ELEVATIONS, AND SECTIONS, ETC.," VOL. I.)	255
PLAN OF THE PRINCIPAL STOREY, THORNDON HALL, ESSEX. (FROM J. PAINE'S "PLANS, ELEVATIONS AND SECTIONS, ETC.," VOL. II.)	257
PLANS OF THE LORD VISCOUNT CHARLEMONT'S CASINO AT MARINO. (FROM CHAMBERS'S "CIVIL ARCHITECTURE," PLATE 37.)	265
ENTRANCE TO NEWGATE PRISON	271
A PLAN SHOWING PROPOSED ADDITIONS AND ALTERATIONS (LATE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY) TO A SIXTEENTH CENTURY HOUSE. (ALL SOULS' COLLECTION.)	277
STAIRCASE, ASHBURNHAM HOUSE	279
PLAN OF LINDSEY HOUSE. (FROM "VITRUVIUS BRITANNICUS," I. 49.)	281
A PLAN AMONGST WREN'S DRAWINGS. (ALL SOULS' COLLECTION.)	282
PLANS OF ELTHAM CLUB HOUSE	283
PLAN OF MOOR PARK, HERTFORDSHIRE	287
PLAN OF LATHAM HALL	289

PAGE

PLAN OF GROUND FLOOR, WOBURN, BEDFORDSHIRE. ("VITRUVIUS BRITANNICUS," IV. 21.) 291
PLAN AND ELEVATION, VOL. I., NO. 18, WREN'S DRAWINGS. (ALL SOULS' COLLECTION.) 293
PLANS AMONGST WREN'S DRAWINGS. (ALL SOULS' COLLECTION.) . 295
PLANS OF DOCTOR HEBERDEN'S HOUSE, BUILT BY HIM IN PALL MALL. (FROM J. PAINE'S PLANS, ELEVATIONS AND SECTIONS.) 299
MAPPERTON IN DORSETSHIRE 320
CARVING TO WOOD PANEL, CHRIST CHURCH, HANTS. 323
A SPUR, SMARDEN, KENT 324
HALF-TIMBER HOUSE, ROLVENDEN, KENT. EARLY SEVENTEENTH CENTURY 325
HOUSE AT SISSINGHURST, KENT. SEVENTEENTH CENTURY . . 326
SPARROW'S HOUSE, IPSWICH 328
COLONNADE, KNOLE 329
MARKET HALL, LEDBURY 331
CUPOLA TO HOSPITAL FOR DECAYED FISHERMEN, GREAT YARMOUTH (1702) 333
ENTRANCE TO CORSHAM COURT 334
HOUSE AT BURWASH, SUSSEX (1699) 335
PART OF WALL AT AMESBURY, WILTSHIRE 336
GATEHOUSE, SANDWICH 337
STONE DOORHEAD, CORSHAM 338
THE TOWN HALL, ABINGDON 341
DETAIL TO HOUSE IN WEST STREET, CHICHESTER 343
DOORWAY AT CLARE, BY R. GRUMBOLD 344
ST. GEORGE'S, GREAT YARMOUTH 345
TOWN HALL, WALLINGFORD 346
A TOMBSTONE, DORCHESTER 347
BRICKWORK AND TERRA-COTTA, GREAT SNORING RECTORY, NORFOLK 349
ENTRANCE TO STABLES, CALE HILL, KENT. 353
CHIMNEY STACK, EAST BARSHAM, NORFOLK 355
POCOCK SCHOOL, RYE 357
CHORISTERS' SCHOOL, THE CLOSE, SALISBURY 359
HOUSE AT ARUNDEL, GRAY VITRIFIED BRICKS AND RED BRICKS . 361
CEILING TO DRAWING-ROOM, STOCKTON, WILTSHIRE 363
CEILING IN THE STAR INN, GREAT YARMOUTH 365
CEILING TO HOUSE IN WHITECROSS STREET, LONDON . . . 366
PLASTER WORK, STANSTEAD 367
PLASTER PANEL, HIGH STREET, CANTERBURY 368
THE OLD FISHPOND HOUSES. (FROM AN OLD PRINT.) . . . 369
HOUSE AT SAFFRON WALDEN, ESSEX 370
PART OF CEILING DESIGNED BY JOHN WEBB, 1666, FOR HIS MAJESTY'S WITHDRAWING-ROOM AT GREENWICH. (FROM A DRAWING AT CHISWICK.) 371

PAGE

PLASTER CORNICE, ASHBURNHAM HOUSE 373
PART OF PLASTER PANEL, BURWASH, SUSSEX 374
PLASTER SPANDREL IN THE RADCLIFFE LIBRARY, OXFORD . . 375
LEAD CISTERN AT THE VYNE, BASINGSTOKE 378
LEAD CISTERN, EAST GRINSTEAD 379
RAIN-WATER HEAD, ST. JOHN'S, CAMBRIDGE 380
RAIN-WATER HEAD, SHREWSBURY, 1730 381
RAIN-WATER HEAD, MELBOURNE, 1744. 381
LEAD FIGURE OF ACTÆON, CARSHALTON 382-3
LEAD URN, PARHAM, SUSSEX 384
GRILLE, CURREY RIVELL 385
IRON STANDARD, BURFORD, OXFORDSHIRE 386
CASEMENT FASTENER, GUILDFORD. 387
GATES, ALL SOULS', OXFORD 388
DETAIL OF GATES, ALL SOULS', OXFORD 389
PART OF GATES, BEVERLEY MINSTER 390
GATES, SHERBORNE ABBEY 391
IRON SQUARE STANDARD, KING'S LYNN 392
GARDEN DOOR, SHAW HOUSE, NEWBURY 395
URN ON ONE OF THE GATE PIERS, HAMPSTEAD MARSHALL . . 404

LIST OF SEPARATE PLATES.

OLD BUCKINGHAM HOUSE. ELEVATION . . . . *To face page* 190
THE CUSTOM HOUSE, KING'S LYNN . . . . . „ 192
THORESBY HOUSE. SECTION . . . . . „ 194
CHATSWORTH . . . . . „ 194
BLENHEIM PALACE. ELEVATION . . . . . „ 194
„ „ PLAN . . . . . „ 198
CASTLE HOWARD. CENTRAL ELEVATION . . . . „ 198
„ „ PLAN . . . . . „ 198
„ „ GENERAL ELEVATION . . . . „ 200
EASTON NESTON HOUSE . . . . . „ 202
CLARENDON BUILDING, OXFORD . . . . . „ 206
QUEEN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD . . . . . „ 208
SIR GREGORY PAGE'S HOUSE, BLACKHEATH . . . „ 216
OLD BURLINGTON HOUSE. ELEVATION . . . . „ 218
WANSTEAD HOUSE (*Second Design*) . . . . . „ 218
HOUGHTON HALL . . . . . „ 220
THE ADMIRALTY . . . . . „ 222
MEREWORTH CASTLE, KENT. SECTION . . . . „ 226
MOOR PARK, HERTS. . . . . „ 228

HOLKHAM HALL, NORFOLK	*To face page*	230
„ „ „ PLAN	„	230
STOWE PARK. TEMPLE	„	230
THE HORSE GUARDS	„	232
THE SENATE HOUSE, CAMBRIDGE	„	238
„ „ „ INTERIOR	„	238
KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE	„	240
RADCLIFFE LIBRARY, OXFORD	„	240
DITCHLEY. PLAN AND ELEVATION	„	242
CHIMNEY-PIECES BY I. WARE	„	242
SPENCER HOUSE	„	246
PRIOR PARK, BATH	„	248
THE MANSION HOUSE, LONDON	„	250
WORKSOP. SECTION	„	254
KEDLESTON	„	256
„ SECTION	„	256
„ PLAN	„	256
THORNDON HALL	„	258
KEW BRIDGE	„	258
WARDOUR HOUSE, WILTSHIRE	„	260
HAREWOOD HOUSE, YORKSHIRE	„	262
SOMERSET HOUSE	„	266
THE CUSTOM HOUSE, DUBLIN	„	268
LUTON HOUSE. PLAN	„	272
PLAN OF HOUSE IN GROSVENOR SQUARE	„	272
LUTON HOUSE. ELEVATION	„	274
KENWOOD HOUSE. SECTION	„	276
CHEVENING. ELEVATION AND PLAN	„	280
TWO PLANS, SAID TO BE FOR MAIDEN BRADLEY	„	290
WOBURN ABBEY	„	290
BUCKINGHAM HOUSE. PLAN	„	294
THE DUKE OF YORK'S HOUSE, PALL MALL. SECTION	„	298
CLOCK FACE, RYE CHURCH, SUSSEX	„	334
CLARE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE	„	344
WOTTON HOUSE, BUCKINGHAMSHIRE	„	358
OSMASTON HALL	„	360
HARDWICK HALL. THE PRESENCE CHAMBER	„	364
A CEILING IN CHESTERFIELD HOUSE	„	368

CHAPTER VIII.

WREN'S CONTEMPORARIES AND SUCCESSORS: JARMAN, WYNNE, BELL OF LYNN, TALMAN, VANBRUGH, HAWKSMOOR, ALDRICH, CLARK, BURROUGH, ESSEX.

IN spite of the generally brilliant success of Wren's career, and the wide influence he exerted over the vernacular architecture of the time, he cannot be said to have had an immediate following either among his contemporaries or his successors. Gibbs imitated him in his churches, but Hawksmoor followed Vanbrugh rather than Wren. Campbell sneered in his spiteful way at Wren's disregard of orthodox rules, Wynne had a manner of his own, and Talman, the only architect who was strictly Wren's contemporary, was his rival throughout, and never lost a chance of putting difficulties in his way. In so far as Wren had been influenced by continental architecture at all, he drew his inspiration from French rather than Italian sources, and after the accession of William III. he borrowed freely from contemporary Dutch architecture; but whether Wren borrowed from other countries or followed his own invention, his work was essentially his own. Before his death, however, there was a definite reaction against his free and spontaneous manner, and a successful attempt was made to re-introduce the rigorous standard of Palladio by direct and almost servile imitation of his work. When the first volume of Campbell's "Vitruvius Britannicus" was published in 1715, this reaction had established itself all along the line.

Of the earlier architects of the Restoration very little is known. Edward Jerman (or Jarman) was architect of the new Royal Exchange, built on the site of Gresham's building, and completed in 1669.[1] Jerman is said to have designed Merchant Taylors' Hall (since altered), Fishmongers' Hall (rebuilt 1831), Drapers' Hall (not the front), and Haberdashers' Hall. He was surveyor to Gresham College, and, after the Great Fire, was invited to report on the re-building of the Exchange,

[1] It was burnt to the ground in 1838, when the present building was erected from Tite's design. A good view of Jerman's building by Shepherd was published by Ackerman in 1819.

together with Mr. Horne, and Mr. Mills, the City surveyor; and his plan was adopted by the Committee on the ground "of the great burthen of businesse lying upon him (Mr. Mills) for the City at this time, and considering that Mr. Jerman is the most able knowne artist (besides him) that the City now hath."[1] There is a print of the Royal Exchange in Campbell's second volume ("Vitruvius Britannicus"). Jerman followed the old courtyard plan of Gresham's building, with a covered walk, and arcades on the sides to the court. The court was entered by a lofty arch, flanked by engaged Corinthian columns with segmental pediments. Above the arch was a tower in three storeys with a kind of Gothic tracery to the windows, surmounted by Gresham's grasshopper. The arcade was rusticated and, instead of an entablature, had a moulded string course with foliage. The details throughout were crude, and show but a faint acquaintance with the methods of classical architecture, but the building as a whole appears to have been a good deal more interesting than the present Stock Exchange. Campbell mentions that "the rustic arcade is generally condemned by the critics for having piers but one-fourth of the arch, which renders it weak," and this criticism is certainly borne out by the engraving. As laid down by Palladio, intercolumniations were never to be more than three diameters of the columns (except in the Tuscan order) and never less than one and a half, and he recommends two and a quarter diameters as a good proportion. No other work of Jerman's is known.

The work of "the ingenious and learned Captain Wynne," so far as it is known, is at a much higher level than Jerman's. Captain Wm. Wynne, or Winde,[2] is said by Walpole to have been born at Bergen-op-Zoom, and to have been the pupil of Balthazar Gerbier. His chief works were alterations to Coomb Abbey, Hampstead Marshall for Lord Craven, Newcastle House in Lincoln's Inn Fields, old Cliefden House[3] and old Buckingham House in St. James's Park. Hampstead Marshall was begun in 1662, according to Walpole, on the site of the older house. There is a view of it in Kyps's "Britannia Illustrata,"[4]

[1] The writer in the "Dictionary of Architecture," article "Jerman," says that Jerman died before November 28th, 1668, when Mr. Cartwright, mason, declared himself master of the design, and was allowed to carry on the work.

[2] Walpole ("Anecdotes of Painters") calls him Winde, Campbell ("Vitruvius Britannicus," vol. i.) calls him Wynne.

[3] Burnt in 1795.

[4] The accuracy of Kyps's views has often been questioned, I think, somewhat unnecessarily. In this particular case the actual position of the raised terrace at the end of the garden, the semicircular walls to the garden court entrance, and the brick piers



PIER, HAMPSTEAD MARSHALL. Capt. Wynn

made before 1709, which shows a large rectangular house of three storeys and an attic, ranged round three sides of a court, with the stables at the back, and the pleasure gardens on the south side. On the entrance front, facing east, there were five two-storey bays, rather Jacobean in character, and three tall cupolas on the roof. The house was burnt to the ground in 1718, and all that remains are a walled-in garden, seven acres in extent, with a raised terrace, and eight sets of entrance piers, four of gauged brick and stone, and the rest entirely of stone. These piers are among the finest of their kind in England. The brick piers have niches and large stone urns, the stone piers have richly carved panels in high relief, very much undercut. In places the foliage is pierced, and partly detached from the stone, and the French influence is evident throughout the work. Wynne—for this work belongs to the latter part of the seventeenth century, and must have been designed by him and not by Gerbier—was evidently an accomplished artist, and this impression is confirmed by the engravings of his designs of Buckingham House and Cliefden House. Old Buckingham House was remarkable as one of the earliest instances of the plan afterwards used so frequently by the eighteenth century architects,[1] of a large rectangular central block, connected by quadrant colonnades with detached sets of offices, treated as pavilions in advance of the main building, and forming three sides of the forecourt. The façade of the centre block at Buckingham House was more sumptuous, but hardly so attractive as the elevation of Cliefden House which was begun by Wynne and completed by Archer, who added the two-storey offices on the north side. The main central block at Cliefden consisted of a three-storey building of great height, of brick with stone quoins and entablature. The façade has nine windows to each storey, each tier of windows being treated as a single feature from the ground to the cornice by means of continued architraves, otherwise the front had little attempt at ornament. On the west front was the

which are all that is left, tally exactly with Kyps's view. The pier illustrated in the text is one of the pair at the end of the avenue in the near foreground: the original drawing for it, freely sketched in Indian ink, is to be found in the folio of drawings by Jones, Wren, and others in the Soane Museum.

[1] An imperfectly developed form of this plan existed at Stoke Park ("Vitruvius Britannicus," iii. 9), begun by Inigo Jones, 1640, and finished probably by Webb after the Civil War. A fuller discussion of this plan will be found in chapter xii., dealing with the house planning of the eighteenth century architects. The plan of old Buckingham House by Wynne is in the folio of the Soane Museum referred to above. The grounds and gardens are shown in detail, with a straight canal at the back running east and west, 875 ft. long by 55 ft. broad.



The Elevation of BUCKINGHAM House *in* St. JAMES's PARK.
Is most humbly Inscribd to his grace the Duke *of* BUCKINGHAM, Lord President *of* Council.

Wynne,

ELEVATION OF OLD BUCKINGHAM HOUSE.

(Vitruv. Brit. I., 44)

[to face p. 190

immense terrace, carried on arches 433 ft. long and 24 ft. high above the parterre. Whether this was carried out by Wynne, or by Archer



PLAN OF NEWCASTLE HOUSE. ALL SOULS' COLLECTION. Wynne

in completion of Wynne's design, is not known. Of his simpler work, Newcastle House, designed for Lord Powis about 1668, is a good

example. The front had originally a stone cornice above the second floor, and a balcony to the entrance. There is a ground plan of the house in the All Souls' collection of drawings. Wynne appears to have died early in the eighteenth century. Walpole says that his drawings for Hampstead Marshall and Coomb Abbey were dated from 1663 to 1695, and the date given by Campbell for Buckingham House is 1705.

Henry Bell, the architect of the Custom House and of other buildings in King's Lynn and the neighbourhood, is another architect who, in spite of his ability, is almost unknown.[1] It appears from an inscription on a stone[2] which used to lie in the north aisle of old St. Margaret's Church at King's Lynn (destroyed 1741) that Bell was born in 1653, was twice mayor of Lynn, and died in 1717. Bell was evidently a man of unusual capacity. He was trained as an engraver, and executed various topographical prints of Lynn, including the view of the Custom House reproduced in the text, and it was probably his skill in draughtsmanship that led him to undertake design, for there is no evidence that he had any specific training in architecture. His first building seems to have been the Custom House, built as an exchange, at the cost of John Turner, in 1681, the date on the inscription over the entrance door. This admirable little building originally consisted of an open Loggia, about 40 ft. by 32 ft. outside, with four columns down the centre, supporting the first floor, and an attic storey above. The walls are of Portland stone, with a Doric order to the ground storey supporting an Ionic order to the first floor. The cornice is of wood, and above this is a steep pitched tile roof with dormers, surmounted by a balustrade, inclosing a flat, from which rises a most picturesque wooden cupola. The details are extremely refined, and the technical knowledge and delicate sense of scale and proportion shown in this building are surprising in a designer who was under thirty, and is not known to have done any previous work.

It is probable that Bell's next important building was the Duke's Head Inn in Tuesday Market-place, which was built before 1689. This has been completely spoilt outside by being covered with plaster; but, previous to this, the front was of red brick with stone dressings, mullions, and transoms to the windows; and the fine proportions of

[1] I am indebted to Mr. E. M. Beloe, of King's Lynn, for the few particulars as yet ascertained about this architect.

[2] Hic jacet Henricus Bell, aldermannus hujus municipii bis prætor, vir ingenii admodum capacis variis artibus. Pictura præseptim et architectura instructissimus. ob. April 11. anno æt. 64. Dom. 1717.

THE CUSTOMS HOUSE, KING'S LYNN.

(From an engraving by the designer, H. Bell.)

Henry Bell

[to face p. 192



DOORWAY IN QUEEN STREET, KING'S LYNN.

the original design are still apparent in the modillion cornice and the boldly conceived broken pediment above the centre bay. The fine house in Queen Street, with the twisted Corinthian columns to the entrance, dated 1708, is also attributed to Bell. His next authentic work was the old market cross, 1707-1710. Mr. Beloe describes it as "an octagon surmounted by a dome and cupola. On the four sides which had not windows were statues, and a balcony went round it supported by pillars." On the frieze with other inscriptions come the words, "Henrico Bell, architecto." This building was pulled down in 1831, and sold for old materials; and two other known works by Bell, the altar piece of St. Margaret's Church, 1684, and that of St. Nicholas' Chapel, at King's Lynn, were destroyed in the restorations of these churches. Bell was paid £10 for his design of the altar piece of St. Margaret's, but expended this sum in gilding the ornaments. The only other recorded design by Bell is North Runcton Church, about three miles out of Lynn. The tower of the old church fell in on August 15th, 1701, and destroyed the greater part of the church. Bell was called on to design the new church, which was more or less completed by about 1713. The church consists of a nave, chancel, and organ chamber, with a tower at the west end. The exterior was originally covered with plaster, which has been removed at the east end, showing engaged brick pilasters carrying a simple brick entablature with a plain gable over; but the chief interest of the church is the simple and very effective treatment of the interior. The nave is square, measuring internally 30 ft. 6 in. by 30 ft. 6 in. Within this space are four columns of the Ionic order on high pedestals supporting lintols, which divide the ceiling into eight flat panels round the sides, while the large central space is covered in with a dome, square on plan, formed by two intersecting semicircular vaults. The church had originally galleries, and has been a good deal injured by injudicious restoration, but it is still a remarkable instance of an eighteenth century village church, designed in the simplest possible manner. No other work of Bell's is known. His few undoubted designs show a distinct and charming manner of his own, and make it the more to be regretted that such scanty record remains of this modest and very able artist.

The reputation indeed of architects is not always in proportion to their abilities. William Talman, for example, is best known as the architect of Chatsworth (1681), which, says Campbell, "for the quality of materials, neatness of execution, rich furniture, and all proper decorations, is second to none in the kingdom, and perhaps in Europe." Campbell's



SECTION OF THORESBY HOUSE. Talman 1671

(Vitruv. Brit. V., 13)

[to face p. 194



CHATSWORTH.

(Vitruv. Brit. I., 75)

[to face p.



ELEVATION OF BLENHEIM PALACE.

(Vitruv. Brit. I., 57)

Vanbrugh

[to face p. 194



NORTH RUNCTON CHURCH, NORFOLK.

Restored by Bell. 1731

faint praise is in this case justified. The plan,[1] which is quadrangular, and ranged round a court 75 ft. by 96 ft., is wasteful of space and material, and inconvenient,—the elevations are ambitious, but miss the happy grace of Wren. The basement of the south elevation is not high enough for the order over it, and the key-blocks to the windows are of the most inordinate size.[2] Talman, in fact, had no nice perception of scale, or delicacy of handling, and these defects appear in the elevation of Thoresby House, since destroyed, which was built in 1671. The plan of this house appears to have been chiefly taken up with halls and staircases. Walpole also attributes to Talman Swallowfield in Berkshire, and Dynham House in Gloucestershire (1698).[3] When William III. began his alterations at Hampton Court, Talman was appointed comptroller of the works, a position quite independent of Wren as surveyor, and apparently superior, for whereas Wren received 4*s.* 10*d.* a day, Talman was paid 6*s.* 10*d.* In this capacity Talman thwarted Wren at every point. In 1689 some workmen were killed by the fall of a wall, and the adoption of Wren's report on the accident was opposed by Talman, apparently with the object of checking the works. Talman was overruled, and the works allowed to proceed. Again, in 1699, on the question of the appointment of a new clerk of the works at Hampton Court, Talman in his report accused Wren of dishonest conduct, and he never refers to Wren in any of his reports as a person to be consulted in regard to the building. His intrigues were so far successful that in 1699 Talman designed various works, amounting to £5,514, at Hampton Court, and got into his own hands the execution of the costly works in Bushey Park and the Gardens. Talman's name does not appear in the list of subscribers to the first edition of the "Vitruvius Britannicus,"[4] and as this list was made up before March 25th, 1715, he probably died before that date. Talman seems to have been of the true type of the official architect. His work has the technical ability found in the work of nearly every known English architect of the Restoration, and onwards till the latter part of the eighteenth century; that is to say, his design is fairly correct, according to the accepted canons of classical architecture, and his construction is sound though by no means dexterous. But his work is dull, what individuality there is in it is ungracious, unattractive, and limited; there is little trace in it of fine imagination, or

[1] "Vitruvius Britannicus," i. 7, 73.

[2] The building has been materially altered by Wyatt.

[3] "Vitruvius Britannicus," ii. 91, 93.

[4] The Mr. John Talman whose name is in the list was the son of the architect.

even of that wild ambition which gives a morbid interest to the works of Vanbrugh and Hawksmoor.

These two men were almost exact contemporaries. Nicholas Hawksmoor was slightly the older man of the two, but he worked under Vanbrugh as well as under Wren, and his work shows clearly how much he was influenced by Vanbrugh's ideas. For this reason it will be more convenient to deal with Vanbrugh first.

John Vanbrugh was the son of a rich sugar-baker, and was born in 1666. Walpole says that his father, Giles Vanbrugh, was "the son of a Flemish Protestant who fled to escape the persecution of the Duke of Alva." As the Duke of Alva left the Netherlands in 1573 this story is rather doubtful. Vanbrugh occupies a unique position among English architects. For the first thirty-five years of his life he devoted himself to literature with brilliant success, and acquired a distinguished reputation which holds to this day. He then, for reasons unknown, suddenly transferred his exuberant energy to the practice of another art, and astonished the world by a series of portentous buildings without parallel in modern architecture. These buildings met with merciless ridicule from all the critics of the time, and fifty years later Walpole, yelping with the rest, cries out, "He wanted eyes, he wanted all ideas of proportion, convenience, propriety. He undertook vast designs, and composed heaps of littleness;" and it has been the general habit to treat Vanbrugh's architecture as something altogether abnormal and absurd. Sir Joshua Reynolds alone has spoken strongly in his favour. In his thirteenth discourse he maintains that "there is a greater display of imagination" in Vanbrugh's buildings than in any others, and particularly praises the skill of composition with which "to support the principal object, he produced his second and third groups or masses." Reynolds admitted that he judged of architecture merely as a painter, and it is evident from his remarks, for his defence has to some extent given Vanbrugh away. The weak point of Vanbrugh, the fault which showed most clearly his want of training and his ignorance of the actual conditions of architecture, was precisely this habit of approaching architecture from the points of view of a painter, or rather of a scene painter, the habit of considering a building and the parts of a building as simply so much material for effect, without regard to their reasonable use and the necessary limitations of design. It is possible that Vanbrugh's success with stage scenery suggested to him the idea of realizing his canvas palaces in stone, and his great popularity with the Court very soon gave him the opportunity.

In 1702 Vanbrugh was appointed comptroller of the works in succession to Talman. His earliest completed building was a theatre, 1703-1705, afterwards burnt down. He was, however, already engaged on the designs of Castle Howard, begun in 1702 and finished in 1714. Here, and afterwards at Blenheim, the leading idea of his plan was, as Reynolds pointed out, to support his main group by subordinate groups of buildings. Starting from the main block of buildings with a façade to the gardens of 300 ft., he threw out colonnades from the advanced angles of this block towards the forecourt, placed the kitchen court and offices to the left, and the stable court to the right, giving a total frontage of 660 ft. At Blenheim he simplified this plan and set the main block still farther back from the advanced courts to the right and left, improving the proportions of the forecourt, and providing a fine vista from the entrance to the kitchen court right across the forecourt to the stable court beyond. The main block at Blenheim has a frontage of 320 ft., and the total frontage (as figured in Campbell) is 856 ft. In the plans of both houses there is the same arrangement of a hall with staircases on either side, leading to a salon beyond with access to the principal apartments *en suite* to the right and left. In both houses, in spite of their enormous size, there is hardly a single really fine room. At Castle Howard the grand salon is 34 ft. by 25 ft., and at each end of the garden façade is a room 40 ft. by 15 ft. with a semicircular bay; but there is nothing approaching Inigo Jones's double cube room of 60 ft. by 30 ft. at Wilton, a very much smaller house; and at Blenheim, except the great salon, 42 ft. by 35 ft., and the great gallery, 182 ft. long,[1] there is hardly a fine room in the house. Several of the rooms are ill-lighted, and their shapes entirely sacrificed to the elevation. The last thing that Vanbrugh had in his mind was the personal comfort of the inmates of the house. Provided he made his effect he was satisfied. The dome over the hall of Castle Howard, though it tells well in the general elevation, is of a most dreary height from within. The height from the floor to the ceiling is 77 ft., and the diameter of the dome only 27 ft. The hall at Blenheim is better, though still too high.[2] At Grimsthorp in Lincolnshire (1724), where the hall is shown 106 ft. long, 38 ft. wide, and 40 ft. high, with staircases at either end, he returned more or less to the recognized system of proportion. Vanbrugh was knighted in 1714, and in 1716 made surveyor of Greenwich Hospital in succession to

[1] The dimensions given in the text are taken from the plates in "Vitruvius Britannicus."

[2] The dimensions are 71 ft. by 44 ft., and 67 ft. high.



PLAN OF BLENHEIM.

(Vitruv. Brit. I., 62)

Vanbrugh

[to face p. 198



CENTRAL ELEVATION, CASTLE HOWARD.

(Vitruv. Brit. I., 67-8)

Vanbrugh

{to face p. 197



PLAN OF CASTLE HOWARD, YORKS.

(Vitruv. Brit. I., 63)

[to face p. 198

Wren. His principal works, besides Blenheim and Castle Howard, were Eastbury in Dorsetshire (1718), destroyed about 1750, King's Weston, near Bristol, a house for Mr. Duncombe in Yorkshire, Oulton Hall, Cheshire, and Seaton-Delaval in Northumberland (1720-1721). King's Weston, completed in 1715, is an example of Vanbrugh's treatment of a smaller house. The plan follows more or less the ordinary lines. The exterior is chiefly remarkable for its ponderous ugliness, and a line of chimneys treated as an arcade, with detached pedestals above the piers. Vanbrugh's scale was not adapted for anything less than the largest palace; and even in these he leaves the impression of never being able to get his details big enough to please himself.

Yet it is evident, from a comparison of the dates of his work, that Vanbrugh was steadily advancing in mastery of his art till the time of his death. The details of Seaton-Delaval (1720) are less forced than those of Eastbury (1718), and both these houses show a distinct improvement on his earlier planning. Vanbrugh had probably learnt by experience that a great quantity of small rooms was not the right way to get a fine internal effect. Grimsthorpe (1724), his latest work,[1] is, by comparison, a well-arranged and convenient house; and though he could not shake himself free of his gigantic rusticated columns, 3 ft. 6 in. in diameter, and of certain enormous key-blocks, the front is a fine unaffected and almost reasonable design. Had Vanbrugh lived longer it seems that he might have become a really great architect.

Vanbrugh died in 1726. His conceptions were far beyond his powers of execution, and his mind was possessed with a single idea, almost amounting to megalomania. His larger plans are all based on the general scheme already described in reference to Blenheim and Castle Howard, and the one impression which he sought to convey was the majesty of stupendous size. His mind, with all its vigorous energy, seems to have run in a groove, and he does not seem to have been alive to the value of anything but his own peculiar manner. For instance, in 1721, he advised the destruction of three sides of the outer and more important quadrangle at Audley End. Yet Vanbrugh was certainly an original designer. Even in his details, uncouth and ugly as they are, there is evidence of thought in the design, of a deliberate attempt to make them all subordinate to his main idea. He certainly conceived of his building as a whole. He was not content to

[1] Vanbrugh's work at Grimsthorpe consisted of large additions to a much earlier house. The back of the house remains in its original state.

accept the ordinary way of doing things, but endeavoured to think out his design in his own peculiar fashion, and according to the dictates of his very ill-balanced taste. If, to his powerful imagination, Vanbrugh had joined any degree of artistic sensitiveness, he might have succeeded in his effort after great architecture, for he grasped the fundamental principle that the highest effects of architecture can only be reached through the qualities of architecture, not, that is, by sculpture, however fine, but by fine proportion and distribution of mass. Unfortunately Vanbrugh had no taste, and his ambition for size rapidly grew into what can hardly be separated from mania. At Blenheim, not content with the size of the house, he built the great bridge on about four times the scale of the house, constructing this Titanic monument, fine as it is, to cross the upper end of a pond. The simple question of cost would always prevent any serious effort to follow Vanbrugh's lead; and Hawksmoor, who made the attempt in a small way, completely over-reached himself in this regard; yet Vanbrugh remains an interesting figure in the history of English art. His passionate appreciation of the abstract qualities of architecture gives him a place by himself among the architects of a country in which the very existence of those qualities has almost ceased to be recognized.

In the "Vitruvius Britannicus" a certain William Wakefield, Esq., is referred to as the architect of Duncombe Park, Atherton House in Lancashire (1723), and Rookby Park in Yorkshire (1724). It is evident that he closely imitated Vanbrugh, and probably was intrusted with the superintendance of some of his designs in the north as Vanbrugh's health failed. Nothing more is known of Wakefield as an architect.

Vanbrugh's successor was Hawksmoor, born at East Drayton in 1661. At the age of eighteen he entered Wren's office as "his scholar and domestic clerk;" and for the next thirty years of his life served Wren faithfully in the superintendence of his various buildings. In 1683 he was employed by Wren as supervisor at Winchester, and deputy-surveyor at Chelsea Hospital. In 1690 he was appointed clerk of the works at Kensington Palace; in 1698, clerk of the works at Greenwich Hospital; and in 1705, deputy-surveyor. He also worked for Wren at Queen's College, Oxford, in 1692-1695, the date of the library, which was designed by Wren and not by Hawksmoor. Till the end of the seventeenth century he had been working entirely for Wren; but when Castle Howard was begun in 1702 he assisted Vanbrugh, and was appointed his deputy-surveyor at Blenheim 1710-

GENERAL ELEVATION OF CASTLE HOWARD.

(Vitruv. Brit. I., 63)

Vanbrugh.

[to face p. 200

CHRIST CHURCH, SPITALFIELDS.

1715; and from 1715 till the time of his death, in 1736, besides work which he carried out on his own account, he filled various official posts, such as that of secretary and draftsman to the Board of Works and deputy-surveyor. Hawksmoor's manner was thus derived from two very different sources, and the influences of Wren and of Vanbrugh appear in his work, not always in perfect fusion. From Wren he learnt his technique, and acquired a mastery of architectural detail far beyond the very limited knowledge of Vanbrugh. But the latter influenced his design in an unmistakable manner; the effort after simple size which is found in Hawksmoor's work, his constant ambition to pile up great masses of masonry, must be attributed to his association with Vanbrugh. The consequence was that Hawksmoor, who was a well-trained architect, was incessantly trying to translate Vanbrugh into terms of Wren, and while, owing to his tamer nature, he missed the turbulent power of Vanbrugh, he was prevented by the ideal at which he aimed from attaining the grace and suavity of Wren. This appears in his designs for Lord Leimpster's house (1713, "Vitruvius Britannicus," i. 100). The façade of the main block is comparatively simple and unaffected, but over the centre bay there is a great cupola of masonry, and the side blocks, which are advanced beyond the main façade, are piled up in the nightmare manner of Vanbrugh, without regard or relation to the more orthodox design of the main façade. The waste of material shown in the plan of the forecourt is as unreasonable as the most prodigal of Vanbrugh's designs. The tower of St. Mary Woolnoth is another characteristic example. The lower storey of the west front is on the scale of Blenheim, and an evident reminiscence of Vanbrugh; the stage above this is slightly out of scale with the lower storey, though not aggressively so; but above the entablature of this stage Hawksmoor seems to have lost all touch of his original motive, and in the two small turrets to have reverted to some recollection of Wren. The finest feature in this church is the north front; there is much refinement of design in the recessed semicircular headed niches, and the recondite treatment of the mouldings. Hawksmoor evidently gave a great deal of thought to his designs; he was not content to carry out a detail in any way in which it had ever been done before, and in this regard he was much more successful than Vanbrugh, thanks to the thorough training he had received from Wren.

When Queen Anne's Act for the building of fifty new churches was passed in 1708, Hawksmoor was employed as one of the architects, and in 1716 he, with James of Greenwich, succeeded Gibbs as surveyor to

H. N. King, Photo.

Face p. 202.

EASTON NESTON HOUSE.

Designed for Lord Leimpster by Nicholas Hawksmoor; finished anno 1713. *See* "Vitruvius Britannicus," i. pp. 98, 99-100. The cupola over the centre bay and the figures over the pilasters, shown in Campbell's plate, were omitted in execution.

the commissioners. The following churches were built from his designs: St. Anne's, Limehouse, 1712-1724; St. George's-in-the-East, 1715-1723; St. Mary Woolnoth, 1716-1719; St. George's, Bloomsbury, 1720-1730; and Christ Church, Spitalfields, 1725-1729. Hawksmoor was also the architect of St. Alphege, at Greenwich (1711-1718), except the steeple, and he gave designs for St. Giles-in-the-Fields, but these were not carried out. St. George's, Bloomsbury, one of the earliest instances of the church with a projecting portico, and Christ Church, Spitalfields, are on the whole the finest of Hawksmoor's churches. The grouping of the projecting portico and of the tower to St. George's, Bloomsbury, is happy, and the portico itself is finely designed. The weak parts of the design are the succession of steps to the upper part of the tower, and the prison-like feeling of the interior, due to excessive



PLAN OF CHRIST CHURCH, SPITALFIELDS.

height and clumsy proportion. The steps to the steeple are always said to have been an attempt to realize the mausoleum at Halicarnassus. The idea, however, is found in some of Wren's towers, such as St. Mary Magdalene's, Old Fish Street, and St. Michael, Queenhythe (since destroyed), and it is also shown in the drawing of the rejected design for St. Paul's, now in the vestry, in which Wren proposed to use it above the secondary dome over the nave. Christ Church, Spitalfields, is in some ways one of the most original churches in London. Its plan resembles the ordinary rectangular church with nave and aisles designed by Wren, but there is a remarkable feature at the east end, and in the tower Hawksmoor broke away from all precedent. At the first column from the east end Hawksmoor has returned the entablature right across from north to south, with two additional columns inserted in the width of the nave, thus forming a screen, and above this he has placed the royal arms. The effect is fine, though somewhat overcrowded. The tower stands at the west end, and beyond it is a bold portico of four detached columns carrying an entablature, with a circular pediment in the centre. The plan of the tower is square, but Hawksmoor has extended the east and west walls towards the north and south for about two-thirds of the way up, so that it is wider on the face than on the side, and has then come back to the square with curved ramps. Above this is a low square stage, terminating in an octagonal steeple.[1] The design is full of peculiarities, such, for instance, as the circular sweeps of the entablature on the north and south sides, the little arcaded stage below the steeple, and the bold ramps which terminate the buttresses, and its extremely impressive effect is due to purely architectural qualities; that is to say, there is no carving or ornament on the tower, and it depends solely on its proportions and the disposition of its planes. Next to St. Bride's and St. Mary-le-Bow, this is probably the finest and most original Renaissance steeple in England.

Hawksmoor's best and worst work is to be found at Oxford. His worst work is the north quadrangle of All Souls' College. Hawksmoor was consulted on the advisability of destroying all the old buildings. He pleaded, however, for the preservation of all that "was strong and durable," and it is probable that it was in pursuance of some vagary of

[1] In Akerman's coloured views of this church several lucarnes are shown in the sides of this steeple, which by no means improve it. A good part of the tower was burnt in 1836, and in 1867 the upper part of the tower, from the parish room upwards, was rebuilt under the direction of Mr. Christian, who, apparently, did not think it necessary to replace these windows.



ENTRANCE TO QUEEN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD. Hawkesmoor.

the college authorities that Hawksmoor here attempted a Gothic design. The cloister on the west side has a plain groined ceiling, springing from engaged Doric columns, but an absurd effort was made to Gothicize this by the introduction of plinths and string courses on the side to the quadrangle. The towers on the opposite side are among the very worst examples of new Gothic design to be found in this country. Their outline is restless and unmeaning, the details are irrelevant, and it is curious that Hawksmoor, who had a positive mania for size and massiveness, should have dropped into this singularly futile manner when attempting a Gothic design. In its want of apparent stability and its hard, mechanical feeling, it is altogether inferior to Wren's Gothic, and Hawksmoor had so entirely lost touch of the intention and constructive reasonableness of Gothic architecture that he has here placed a very large and solid pinnacle immediately over the centre of a window. Hawksmoor also made designs for a new front of All Souls' to the High Street, for re-building Brasenose College, and for the Radcliffe Library, none of which were carried out, and in 1715 he made plans for re-building King's, Cambridge, but, as in the case of the Radcliffe, his designs were rejected in favour of Gibbs.

Hawksmoor's best work at Oxford is the south quadrangle at Queen's, including the hall, chapel, and the front to the High Street, and the old Clarendon Press buildings, in which he was associated with Vanbrugh. These buildings seem to have been designed about 1710, when Hawksmoor was working at Blenheim, and they show evidence of a common motive. Both in the south quadrangle of Queen's and in the Clarendon Press buildings there is the same treatment of bays, the two storeys are brought into a single panel by being recessed between pilasters carried up from the plinth to the entablature, and both the hall and chapel of Queen's, and the Clarendon Press, have the huge single order which was afterwards imitated by Clarke at Christ Church, and which had been deliberately rejected by Wren at St. Paul's as wasteful and impracticable. In the Queen's buildings Hawksmoor was not sufficiently audacious, the east and west sides of the quadrangle lose their weight by the insignificant blocking course above the cornice, and the great Doric order of the hall and chapel carries nothing but a balustrade. There is consequently an evident excess of strength, out of all ratio to the work to be done. Hawksmoor, in fact, over-reached himself. The Clarendon Press is more successful, and on its own inhuman system of proportions is very finely designed. It is probable that Vanbrugh gave the general idea, but that Hawksmoor made the

Wilson, Aberdeen, Photo.

CLARENDON BUILDING, OXFORD.

Hawksmoor

Face p. 206.

drawings and superintended the work, for which he received a gratuity of £100. The design is of a finer quality than any by either Vanbrugh



A PLAN AMONGST WREN'S ALL SOULS' COLLECTION (POSSIBLY BY HAWKSMOOR).

or Hawksmoor singly. The scale is well maintained throughout, the details are simple, and in its general balance and light and shade the

building is an impressive instance of architecture in the grand manner. The worst of "the grand manner" in a town, is that, owing to its excessive costliness, it has but rare opportunities, and consequently, as in this case, overpowers the adjacent buildings. Hawksmoor succeeded Wren as surveyor to Westminster Abbey in 1723, and completed the west towers. His latest work was a pamphlet on old London Bridge, with plans for its improvement, and he also prepared designs for a new bridge at Westminster, which were never carried out. Hawksmoor died in 1736. He was a modest, unassuming, and honourable man, of exact care in details, and great mechanical knowledge. When Beverley Minster was in imminent danger in 1713, he invented the machinery for screwing up the north part of the north transept, and in all technical knowledge of architecture he was superior to Vanbrugh, who, so far as is known, never had any special training at all. The quality of his imagination was ungraceful and ponderous, yet Hawksmoor was an original designer, and he seriously grappled with the problems of architecture, instead of merely copying Palladio and the accepted Italian models. There is a definite individuality about his work which compensates for its inferiority, in other regards, to the more correct and distinguished manner of the eighteenth century architects.

Architecture had already become an elegant accomplishment of the upper classes. To the free masculine intelligence of Wren had succeeded mere scholarship, rapidly degenerating into pedantry. When a correct use of the orders, according to the recognized canons, was the test of architecture, and the question of cost was seldom raised, the amateur very soon stepped to the front, and began to furnish designs of his own, or, at any rate, to give instructions to draughtsmen who were content to leave to the amateur the credit of the design. A little later we shall find Lord Burlington represented as one of the first architects of his time. Architects probably found it inconvenient to question the claims of their distinguished patrons, but occasionally the "ghost" lost his temper, and amusing revelations followed. In the middle of the eighteenth century a serious quarrel arose between Essex of Cambridge and the Rev. Robert Masters, Fellow of Corpus, as to the authorship of a design for the new quadrangle, which ended by Essex inviting the amateur to produce the working drawings. The Rev. Robert Masters appears to have declined the challenge.

The ablest, as well as the earliest of these amateurs, was Henry Aldrich, Dean of Christ Church (died 1710). Aldrich's reputation rests on more or less solid grounds. He left in MSS. a collection of notes

Wilson, Aberdeen, Photo.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD.

Face p. 208.



ALL SAINTS, OXFORD. Aldrich

on the elements of civil architecture in accordance with the rules of Vitruvius and Palladio, which was published in 1789, and no suggestion has been made that his designs were actually made by anybody else, though as Wren and Hawksmoor were often at Oxford, it is probable that he availed himself largely of their advice. His Church of All Saints at Oxford is an original and impressive design. The church itself consists of a great oblong room, 75 ft. by 45 ft., with a gallery and organ at the west end, and a lofty tower. The latter is very well managed; the lower part is square, and terminates in a balustrade with urns at the angles; within the balustrade rises a circular drum, supporting a colonnade of detached Corinthian columns, with entablature and pierced balustrade. Within this upper balustrade rises a panelled octagon steeple, terminating in a Corinthian capital. The details are simple, and the proportions excellent. Aldrich was a very accomplished man, and, within the narrow limits that he set himself, gained a fairly complete mastery of his style. He designed the garden front of Corpus College at Oxford, and the north, east and west sides of Peckwater quadrangle, Christ Church. The latter is a fair example of rather uninteresting, but correct, Palladian design, except for the wide spacing of the pilasters.

Its effect, however, is entirely spoilt by the library on the south side, designed in 1716 by Dr. Clarke, another amateur, who testified his friendship for Aldrich by putting up a tablet to his memory, but showed a very singular disregard of his work when he designed this library, which quite overpowers the rest of the quadrangle. Its façade is in seven bays, with huge engaged Corinthian columns rising up from a low plinth to the entablature, and including two storeys of windows. The principal order is almost on the same scale as that of the Clarendon Press. The diameter of the Doric columns of the latter is 3 ft. 10 in.; that of the Corinthian columns of the Christ Church Library is 4 ft., Clarke evidently intending to outdo the dimensions of the Clarendon Press. The end elevations with Venetian windows are too narrow for the length of the façade, but the angles, with pairs of pilasters, are well managed, and Clarke or his mason met the difficulty of getting back from the pilasters to the engaged columns of the front, without losing the line of the pilaster, with considerable address. The library was not finally completed till 1761. Clarke died in 1736, and bequeathed his collection of drawings, including the designs of Inigo Jones, to Worcester College. It is probable that he had advised on the library of this college, if he did not actually design it. There can be little doubt that both Aldrich and Clarke were consulted on most of the

buildings erected in Oxford between 1680 and 1730, and, on the other hand, that in their own designs they had the advantage, first of Wren's and afterwards of Hawksmoor's advice, and not improbably of Hawksmoor's draughtsmanship. This is evident in the case of Clarke's design for the Christ Church Library. Aldrich's design for All Saints', though it suggests Wren's influence, shows a more definite individuality.

The Cambridge amateurs were later in the field, and I have to interrupt chronological sequence in introducing here some mention of "that ingenious architect," Sir James Burrough. Burrough was born in 1690, was elected to the mastership of Gonville and Caius College in 1754, and died in 1764. "During his university career he practised architecture to a considerable extent, but in what manner his previous education had prepared him for it does not appear. His works are certainly not characterized by great artistic power, and are all in the tamest Italian style;"[1] a very just summary of Burrough's architectural attainments. In 1728 he designed a cupola at Caius, and in 1732 he converted the old hall of Queen's College into an "Italian chamber." In 1736 he gave a design for the new buildings at Peterhouse, the scene of his most unfortunate experiment in architecture, for, in 1754, he was allowed to transform the mediæval quadrangle of this college into an Italian design. Burrough was keenly interested in building: he had all the amateur's weakness for alteration for the sake of alteration, for the simple pleasure of seeing a building grow under his hands without regard to its necessity, and without scruple as to the associations sacrificed in the process. In 1745 he Italianized the court of Trinity Hall, and in 1751 the court of Caius College, and in the same year designed the Doctor's Gallery, in the Church of St. Mary the Great. In these, as in other works, Burrough was helped by James Essex the younger, but he appears to have been officially recognized as the architect of the works intrusted to him, though the fees paid him seem to have been more in the nature of *honoraria* than a settlement of professional charges. Burrough's work showed no evidence of the ability of Aldrich or even of Clarke, and his influence was distinctly for the bad in the history of college architecture. He was one of the first to introduce the habit of altering and re-building ancient buildings, merely because they were not in accordance with the style in fashion at the time, a habit equally disastrous, whether the result was neo-Italian, neo-Gothic, or neo-Greek. The two universities have, in fact, suffered severely from the efforts of zealous amateurs; the ravages of Burrough

[1] Willis and Clarke, iii. 536.

and his contemporaries on the sixteenth and seventeenth century architecture of Cambridge have been repeated in this century in an aggravated form at both universities, and that by eminent architects acting under the instructions of persons whose zeal for mediævalism and ignorance of its actual character were about evenly balanced.

James Essex was actually an architect, though not a particularly good one; his father was a joiner at Cambridge, and Essex seems to have been apprenticed to his father, and to have crept into practice by making himself indispensable to the university amateurs. His earliest design was one for the gardens of King's in 1741. When Burrough rebuilt the hall and butteries to Trinity Hall, in 1745, he was helped by Essex.[1] His dispute with the Rev. Robert Masters in 1748 has been mentioned above. In 1757 he designed the Ramsden Buildings at St. Catherine's Hall, including the chapel, perhaps his best work, though rather coarse in detail. By the middle of the eighteenth century the process of "Italianizing" the earlier buildings was in full fashion at Cambridge, and Essex was employed for this purpose at Trinity, St. John's, and Christ's Colleges. At Trinity he cut away the Jacobean pilasters in Nevile's Court, and substituted a balustrade for the picturesque old gables. Essex, indeed, is not an architect to whom one feels very kindly; he designed the west front of Emmanuel, 1770-1775, and the altar-piece in King's Chapel in 1770, and completed the Chapel of Clare, begun by Burrough, but he also destroyed a considerable quantity of very interesting earlier work, and his own performances were indifferent, though he appears to have been a useful person to the Cambridge amateurs. The appearance, indeed, of the amateur in the field was a dangerous sign. It was partly the cause and partly the effect of a change of direction in the development of English art. The artistic strength and ability that had hitherto found its adequate expression in architecture and craftsmanship was gradually drawing away into other channels, and concentrating itself in the art of painting to the neglect of the other arts. Perhaps this was the Nemesis that awaited the magnificent ambition and consummate accomplishment of the mature Renaissance; in any case, the inevitable decline from that great period had begun. England was soon to possess painters of first-rate genius, but as a set back to this, architecture fell into the hands of men of inferior ability, and the amateur, with the result that tradition was abandoned for merely individual caprice.

[1] A design is preserved in the Trinity Hall Library for the re-building of the Library Court; signed, "J. B., arch.; Jas. Essex, Junior, delin., 1745."—Willis and Clarke, Trinity Hall.

CHAPTER IX.

The Eighteenth Century Architects: Archer, James, Campbell, Ripley, Lord Burlington, Leoni, Kent.

Probably at no time in the history of English architecture has there existed a more perfect knowledge of the technical arts of building than at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Wren and his contemporaries had trained up a highly intelligent school of masons and carpenters, capable of executing the details of Palladian architecture from the roughest indication, so much so that Switzer, writing in 1718, was able to refer to the great skill of the English masons as a matter of common knowledge. It is evident that these tradesmen (using the term in the old-fashioned sense) were men of some education and in good circumstances. In the list of subscribers to the first issue of the "Vitruvius Britannicus" (1715) there appear, among the titles of the most distinguished of the aristocracy, the names of Mr. Blacket, joiner, Mr. Prichard, mason, Mr. Peters, painter, and Mr. Sanders, joiner; and as late as 1767, when Wolfe and Gandon issued vols. iv. and v. of the "Vitruvius Britannicus," several carpenters, bricklayers, masons, and plasterers subscribed for copies.

Moreover, the architects of this period possessed a very intimate knowledge of Palladian architecture. Its subtleties and refinements were made a matter of profound study, and even the least capable of the brilliant group of architects at work in England for the first half of the eighteenth century were perfectly trained in the scholarship of design as then understood. A knowledge of the orders and their right use and proportions, of the variations of usage exhibited in the works of Serlio, Vignola, Palladio, and Scamozzi, of the remains of Roman architecture, and of the rules prescribed in "Vitruvius," and the great Italian text books, was considered indispensable to an architect; and the fine, if somewhat frigid, architecture of the first half of the eighteenth century was the outcome of a training absolutely thorough and complete within its peculiar limits. This method of education contrasts favourably with the haphazard system in use at present; it insured that a young

architect at least knew one thing thoroughly well, and the great tradition of constructive skill begun by Wren was well maintained by his successors, some of whom indeed began their career at the carpenter's bench. The architecture of the first half of the eighteenth century is not always interesting, but it is seldom ignorant in construction or vulgar in design.

Archer, James, Campbell, Gibbs, and Kent were almost contemporaries, and it is not possible to preserve strict chronological sequence in dealing with the successors of Wren. It must be understood, however, that till we come to Chambers and the Adams, the architects mentioned were all more or less of the same standing, and belonged generally speaking to that later school of English Palladian architecture, of which the ablest representatives were Campbell and Gibbs.

Thomas Archer was the son of Thomas Archer, M.P. for Warwick, and was a person of some consideration, being appointed groom porter to Queen Anne, George I., and George II. He was a pupil of Vanbrugh, whose influence probably accounts for certain eccentricities of manner in an individuality not otherwise remarkable. Archer's first work was Heythorpe Hall in Oxfordshire, 1705. In 1709 he designed the elaborate pavilion at the head of the Long Water in Wrest Park, and in 1710 Mr. Cary's house at Roehampton, a plan and elevation of which latter building is given in Campbell.[1] The plan shows a variation on Vanbrugh's favourite scheme of a main block connected by quadrant colonnades with advanced pavilions. It is by no means skilfully managed, however, in Mr. Cary's house, and Archer was more successful in the additions which he designed for Cliefden House (since destroyed), where the colonnade is a quadrant set concave to the forecourt, and the offices are simply treated as two-storey buildings with stone quoins and a heavy cornice. The elevation of Mr. Cary's house is only noticeable for the great broken pediment, a motive which Archer developed later at St. John's, Westminster, with singular results. In 1710 he designed the Church of St. Philip's, Birmingham, which, Campbell says, "was justly esteemed a very beautiful structure." The tower at the west end is helped by its commanding position, but is certainly a powerful and original design, and unlike anything of its kind in England. It is very much finer in execution than would appear from Campbell's plate.[2] The tower starts from above the entablature

[1] "Vitruvius Britannicus," i. 80-81.

[2] This plate does not agree with the tower as actually built; the church was not completed till 1719, and it is probable that Archer altered his design as the work proceeded.

of the church and consists of a belfry stage with four concave sides, and double engaged pilasters on pedestals set on the canted angles. Above the entablature of this belfry is an octagonal stage for a clock, with double buttresses running out to the angles of the lower stage, and a lead dome terminating in an open lantern with a cupola and an iron cross. The play of concave wall surface in contrast with the square returns, and the very ingenious transition from the square to the octagon, a little suggest some of Hawksmoor's elaborate combinations of plain and hollow surfaces. Archer evidently had no intention of adhering to the type of steeple invented by Wren, and continued later by Gibbs. The lofty belfry-stage of St. Philip's shows that he deliberately rejected Wren's favourite device of getting his effect by constant repetition of storeys; and it is possible that he shared with Campbell and his contemporaries their somewhat disparaging view of Wren's powers as a designer. Of its kind St. Philip's is one of the finest steeples in England, and does more to justify Archer's reputation than his

THE TOWER OF ST. PHILIP'S, BIRMINGHAM.

ambitious venture at St. John's, Westminster. This latter church was built, 1721-1728, at a cost of £40,000. The church is extraordinarily ugly, and has been compared to an elephant on its back. In 1730 Archer designed a church at Deptford, and in 1741, Umberslade in Warwickshire. He died in 1743.

John James of Greenwich succeeded Hawksmoor as clerk of the works at Greenwich in 1705, and his work closely resembles Hawksmoor's. As was the case with several of the early eighteenth century architects, James was a man of some literary ability, and published in 1708 a translation of Perrault's treatise of the five orders, in 1710 a translation of Pozzo's rules and examples of perspective, and in 1712 "The Theory and Practice of Gardening," probably by Le Blond or D'Argenville Dezalliers, but the authorship was unknown to James himself. The book is a very interesting and complete account of the system of garden architecture practised by Lenôtre and his school, and is of considerable importance in the history of English architecture, inasmuch as the system of design which it describes was employed in laying out the grounds and gardens of all the great houses built at about this period. In 1711 James succeeded Jennings as master carpenter at St. Paul's, and in 1716 he was appointed assistant-surveyor to St. Paul's, and surveyor to the commissioners for building new churches. His finest design is the important Church of St. George, Hanover Square, 1713-1724, with the well-known portico. The dates of the building of this church and of St. George's, Bloomsbury (1720-1730), overlap, and it is therefore a little uncertain whether the credit of having originated this portico treatment should be given to James or to Hawksmoor. So far as dates go it should probably be assigned to James; and the architecture of this church (St. George's, Hanover Square), though a little ponderous, shows an ability in design quite equal to that of Hawksmoor. James also designed St. Mary's Church at Twickenham in 1713, and a new steeple to St. Alphege at Greenwich in 1730. Of his domestic architecture the only known examples are a house at Twickenham, illustrated by Campbell,[1] and a large house near Blackheath built for Sir Gregory Page in 1721 and destroyed 1787. The latter is illustrated in "Vitruvius Britannicus," vol. iv. The ground plan has the usual arrangement of the main block in the centre, 133 ft. by 73 ft., with colonnade at right angles to the sides connecting with the kitchen wing on the right and the stables on the left, the whole

[1] "Vitruvius Britannicus," i. 77.



S. FRONT OF SIR GREGORY PAGE'S HOUSE. at Greenwich destroyed 1787
(Vitruv. Brit. IV., 61) John James of Greenwich

[to face p. 216

forming three sides of a forecourt 243 ft. by 185 ft. In the plan of the house James availed himself largely of the device of detached columns in the rooms, sometimes to carry walls above, but in some cases solely for effect. The principal floor, with its rooms *en suite*, was admirably arranged for great receptions, though with little regard for privacy, and the elevations as shown on the plates are simple and well-proportioned. James died in 1746. It is evident that he was a capable architect, learned in his art, but somewhat overpowered by his own learning.

The weak point, in fact, of nearly all these early eighteenth century architects is their lack of strong individuality. There is abundant indication in their work of knowledge of architecture, but little trace of enthusiasm or inspiration. It is just a trifle cold and colourless; so much so that, without documentary evidence, it would often be difficult to say whether any given building was by James or Archer, Kent or Campbell. Documentary evidence, however, exists in abundance. These able men were not disposed to leave posterity in ignorance of their attainments. The eighteenth century was from the first fully conscious of its own enlightenment: later in the century Wolfe and Gandon professed their ability to convince posterity "that architecture was brought to as great a point of perfection in this kingdom in the eighteenth century as ever it was known to be among the Greeks and Romans, and that if we were not inferior to the ancients in this respect, we far surpassed our contemporaries of every other country." In this happy confidence the fashion of publishing sumptuous books of measured drawings was introduced very early in the century. It is for this reason that records remain of several architects of capacity, but nothing approaching genius, such as are unfortunately wanting in the case of their more gifted predecessors. Though the value of these records is undoubtedly great, they cannot be trusted implicitly. No such thing as strict historical accuracy existed at the time, and the subjects of the plates were selected quite as much to suit the predilections and personal advertisement of the author as for the impartial illustration of architecture. The most conspicuous offender in this regard was Colin Campbell.

Campbell was a protégé of the Duke of Argyll, and when he came to London early in the eighteenth century, he hit on the happy idea that the best method of advancing his own interests was to publish a series of plates illustrating the works of English architects of admitted reputation, in which he was free to insert numerous designs of his own invention. This may appear a somewhat harsh criticism on a man who, whatever

his defects, did certainly render great service to the history of architecture by this undertaking; but a survey of the first three volumes of the "Vitruvius Britannicus" leads inevitably to the conclusion that Campbell was either uncritical and ignorant of the best work then done in architecture, or that he was malicious and uncandid. His professed object was to make his collection typical; yet of Wren's buildings he only illustrates St. Paul's, Marlborough House, and Bow Steeple. Greenwich is included, but Campbell omits to mention that Wren had anything to do with its design, though he finds room for extravagant rhapsodies on "the beauty, the force, the majesty, of a British pencil," the pencil, that is, of a third-rate painter, Sir James Thornhill, who was employed to decorate the interior. On the other hand, Campbell presents us with Mr. Benson's design [1] for his own house at Wilbury, a great many designs of his own, and a series of fulsome panegyrics on the learning, generosity, and goodness of his various noble patrons.

Campbell's introductory notices are in fact the worst part of his book. He was much more occupied with the noble patron than with the architect, and his criticisms on architecture, in so far as they are bona-fide at all, have regard to the correctness of the design according to academic rules, rather than to its reasonableness or imaginative power. Notwithstanding these vices of taste and temperament, Campbell was himself an accomplished architect. His earliest recorded work was a small house at Shawfield, near Glasgow, for a Mr. Daniel Campbell, of no particular interest, built in 1712, and to this smaller type of house belong the designs for Sir Charles Hotham's house at Beverley, and a house at Chester-le-Street, Durham. Campbell's first important work was the new front and gateway of old Burlington House, 1717-18. The front was in two storeys, and consisted of a rusticated basement, with an Ionic order over, surmounted by a balustrade; the two projecting wings at the ends had Venetian windows; to the right and left of the forecourt were the stables and kitchen. According to Campbell, and there is no reason for doubting his account, he designed all, except the stables and kitchens. In 1718 Campbell designed the admirably proportioned Rolls House in Chancery Lane, one of the best examples of his less ambitious manner; [2] and he repeated the general elevation on a different plan in Mr. Plumptre's House at Nottingham. In 1720 he designed Newby in Yorkshire, a square house, on a very ingenious plan, measuring 76 ft. by 76 ft. Stourhead in Wiltshire is

[1] Mr. Benson is the person already referred to in the chapter on Wren.

[2] Destroyed in 1895-6.

ELEVATION OF BURLINGTON HOUSE.

(Vitruv. Brit. III., 23-24)

[to face p. 218


The W.th Front of Wanstead in Essex the Seat of Sr Richard Child Baronet Hereditary Warden of Waltham Forest &c.
To whom this Plate is most humbly Inscribed
Elevation de L'Entrée du Chateau de WANSTED dans la Comté D'ESSEX appartenant a Mr CHILD Chevalier

WANSTEAD HOUSE (SECOND DESIGN). Camp-bell

(Vitruv. Brit. I., 25)

[to face p. 218



The Plan of the Principal Floor of Wanstead

Plan du Premier Etage

WANSTEAD IN ESSEX. FROM "VITRUVIUS BRITANNICUS," I. XXIII. Campbell

another variation of the same motive, on a plan 92 ft. by 82 ft. In 1720 Campbell made the important designs for Wanstead in Essex. His first design was a three-storey building with a frontage of 200 feet. This was materially modified in the second design, which was given a total frontage of 260 feet, and instead of a regular façade in three storeys, the nine centre bays were carried up three storeys, with a hexastyle portico (according to Campbell, the first of its kind in England), and an open cupola over the centre, while the six bays at the sides were kept to two storeys. The cupola, though an undoubted improvement to the elevation, was purely ornamental. Campbell's description of the plan is typical of the grand house of this period. "You ascend from the court, by double stairs of each side, which land in the Portico, and from thence into the great hall, 51 feet long and 36 wide and in Height the same. This leads into the Salon, being an exact cube of 30 feet, attended with 2 noble apartments of state, all fronting the Gardens." Campbell designed two towers or pavilions for the angles, which do not appear to have been carried out. The whole of this house, considered in its time the finest in England, was destroyed in 1824.

In 1723 Campbell designed Houghton in Norfolk for Sir Robert Walpole. The general plan consists of a great central block, with 166 ft. front, connected by quadrant colonnades with two subordinate blocks containing the laundry court and kitchen court respectively, and giving a total frontage of 450 ft. The north front of Houghton, with its plain wall face and square towers rising one storey above the general entablature, was evidently inspired by the south front of Wilton; but on the south front Campbell introduced one of his favourite porticoes, which harmonizes very ill with the masculine simplicity of Inigo Jones's manner. It appears that after Campbell had made the designs for Houghton the work was taken out of his hands and intrusted to Ripley, who had married one of Walpole's servants. In the "plans, elevations, and sections" of Houghton, published by I. Ware in 1735, Ripley's name is given as architect of the fabric, and Kent as the designer of all the internal decorative work. All that Ripley did was to make the colonnades rectangular instead of quadrant, and to substitute for the attic storey and pediments of Campbell's four towers rather coarse but very picturesque domes surmounted by cupolas. The elevation of the wings is also slightly different from Campbell's design. The general effect of this building, in spite of a certain clumsiness of detail, is exceedingly fine. Campbell's next important building was Mereworth Castle in Kent. This extraordinary design for an English country house



H. Applegate, Photo.

HOUGHTON, NORFOLK. For Sir Robert Walpole
Campbell
Vitruvius Britannicus by Ripley

Face p. 220.

illustrates clearly the gradual decay which was overtaking English architecture. Palladio once made a skilful design of a villa for Monsignor Paolo Almerigo, consisting of a circular hall inclosed in a square, and surrounded by rooms *en suite*. This villa was well adapted for a summer residence in a hot climate. It provided shelter from the blazing sun, and a free current of air in all directions, two qualities essential in Italy, but which exactly disqualified it for a country house in the damp cold atmosphere of the North. Notwithstanding, this design was so much admired by the aristocratic *virtuoso* of the eighteenth century that he was moved to transplant it entire to England, and Campbell duly reproduced Almerigo's villa at Mereworth. Chimneys would have spoilt the effect, and accordingly Campbell (who was certainly a most ingenious person) managed to get rid of his flues through the dome. He formed the dome over the great central hall in three parts, an inner plaster ceiling, an outer dome of wood covered with lead, and between the two a brick dome through which the flues were conducted to discharge their smoke through a small copper cupola at the top. The hall was 38 ft. in diameter and 60 ft. high, and the only light it received was from four circular openings 5 ft. in diameter in the dome. Vanbrugh's extravagance was as nothing to the absurd wastefulness of this design, which was also reproduced at Foot's Cray in Kent, and for Lord Burlington at Chiswick. Such buildings can only be taken as indications of a morbid tendency in architecture, and as the results of a patronage alike ill-instructed and obstinate. The decadence which had already begun was the result, first, of the attempt of architects to make of their art a mystery of fixed rules and canons revealed only to the initiated, and of themselves a close corporation of pedants, and secondly, of the unfortunate fact that architecture had now become a fashionable hobby. Walpole's florid eloquence had rather more truth in it than he knew of. "Under the auspices of Lord Burlington and Lord Pembroke," he writes, "architecture recovered its genuine lustre. The former, the Apollo of arts, found a proper priest in the person of Mr. Kent." Mr. Kent was, no doubt, a very competent ghost, whatever the merits of Lord Burlington, but the result of this artificial treatment was that architecture was losing its touch with the daily life of the English people. It ceased to interest the common intelligence, and the interest so lost has never been recovered. Instead of meeting actual wants, and submitting to their wholesome limitations, architecture was now considered a polite art, its guidance was in the hands of the amateur and the dilettante, indifferently controlled by the unquestionable

knowledge of the architects of the eighteenth century. The next step downward was to subordinate architecture to literary fashion, as we shall see later on in the case of Kent, with the result of the final loss of tradition in architecture, and the more or less complete extinction of any possible starting-point for a new and reasonable development.

Campbell repeated the circular central hall and general design of the Mereworth plan in his fine design for Goodwood (1724), which was never carried out. The hall was to be 40 ft. diameter, 60 ft. high, and lit by a top light 10 ft. in diameter. At Goodwood, however, he entirely abandoned Palladio's elevation, and designed a plain straightforward façade, which in its directness and simplicity is, on the whole, the best of his designs. In 1724 he designed Lord Herbert's house in Whitehall, since destroyed, and a large garden house at Hall Barn, near Beaconsfield, an ambitious but unsuccessful attempt at an impressive building. Campbell died in 1734. That he was an architect of ability and knowledge is evident from his designs; but he never showed the slightest inclination to stand out against the preposterous ideas of his patrons, and indeed his own taste was by no means to be trusted. Where he copied Palladio he introduced some of his worst features; for instance ("Vitruvius Britannicus," vol. ii.), he deliberately copies a bad design of Palladio's at Vicenza, in which the angles, instead of the usual coupled columns or pilasters of the main order, have figures standing on the small engaged columns of the subordinate order. He took from Palladio the great straggling pediment which constantly appears in Campbell's speculative designs, and the futility and pedantry of some of his borrowed plans have already been noticed.[1] He was apt to repeat himself, but he possessed a certain power of invention, and designs such as Houghton, the Rolls House, and Goodwood, show that he was a much more able architect than subsequent writers have been willing to allow.

If the first half of the eighteenth century was an age of princely patronage for architects it was also a period of unrivalled jobbery. The credit of designs was claimed and assigned in the most unscrupulous manner, and Campbell, who had some share in the outrageous dismissal of Wren, had his reward in the loss of Houghton, through the intrigues of Ripley and Kent, and in 1729, in the loss of the surveyorship of Greenwich Hospital, in which he was superseded by Ripley. Ripley was a native of Yorkshire, and began his career as a carpenter.

[1] See above; and chap. vii., p. 186.

Frith & Co., Photo.

THE ADMIRALTY.

Face p. 222.

The main part by Ripley
the screen by Robert Adam 1760

The proportions of the Portico

Through the influence of Walpole, he was, in 1721, appointed chief carpenter to all his majesty's works and buildings in England, in succession to Grinling Gibbons; and it was not only out of favouritism, but probably also on account of his practical knowledge, that Walpole intrusted him with the execution of Campbell's designs for Houghton. In 1726 he succeeded Vanbrugh as comptroller, and about this time he designed the Admiralty buildings, a somewhat clumsy composition, with a very ill-proportioned portico.[1] Ripley also built Wolterton House for Lord Walpole, which Horace Walpole declared to be one of the best houses of the size in England. Ripley's work in Queen Mary's block at Greenwich Hospital, begun soon after 1734, has been described in chapter vii., p. 118. In 1739 he helped Kent with the new Law Courts at Westminster, and showed himself at once unintelligent and ignorant of construction by advising the destruction of the vaulting of the chapter house. He also prepared, in conjunction with Kent, in 1739, designs for new Houses of Parliament, of an estimated cost of £167,067. These plans were approved, but never carried out. Ripley died in 1758. His colleague, William Kent, has for various reasons enjoyed a reputation considerably in excess of his merits. It is necessary, however, to discuss the architectural attainments of his patron, Lord Burlington, before entering on any account of Kent's work. Richard Boyle, Earl of Burlington, was born in 1695, and died in 1753. He was undoubtedly a *virtuoso* of fine taste, and probably had a genuine interest in architecture. It has been customary, however, to represent him as one of the most accomplished architects of his time, a man who, but for his position and social engagements, might have been almost the equal of Inigo Jones. Horace Walpole, for instance, says that Lord Burlington "had every quality of a genius and artist except envy. Though his own designs were more chaste and classic than Kent's, he entertained him in his house till his death, and was more studious to extend his friend's fame than his own." Mr. Loftie, the most recent writer on the subject, says "The greatest of all the architects who followed Wren in the first half of the eighteenth century, was, strange to say, an amateur. This was Richard, 3rd Earl of Burlington."[2] Elsewhere,[3] after pointing out that little of Lord Burlington's work is left, he remarks "enough remains of what is undoubtedly his to justify us in ranking Burlington very little below Inigo Jones." Mr. Loftie bases this opinion more particularly on the

[1] The screen across the front of the court was built by Robert Adam in 1760.

[2] Page 228. [3] Page 41.

design of the dormitory at Westminster. I propose to consider these claims in detail. Lord Burlington's principal works are supposed to be the colonnade, and the new front to Burlington House in Piccadilly (1716-17), the villa at Chiswick (1729), General Wade's house in Cork Street (1723-4), the dormitory at Westminster (1723-4), and the York Assembly Rooms (1730-36). The dates are important as Kent returned to England in 1719, and was given a room in Lord Burlington's house in that year. It will be observed that with the exception of Burlington House, the dates of all these buildings are subsequent to the date at which Kent began his residence at Burlington House, and they are, without exception, subsequent to Leoni's arrival in England. Taking them in order, Colin Campbell distinctly claims the design of Burlington House (with the exception of the offices) as his own. His words are, "The front of the House, the conjunction from thence to the offices, the Great Gate, and street wall, were all designed and executed by me;"[1] and he gives as the date 1717. In describing the Great Gate, he says that the columns are of the Doric order, etc., "agreeable to the colonnade in the court." Either, therefore, this colonnade must have been already in existence, or Campbell is referring to it as an integral part of his own design for the street end of the forecourt. The colonnade has also been attributed to Giacomo Leoni, and what little evidence there is on the subject makes it probable that Leoni, not Campbell, actually designed the colonnade. Further, Campbell expressly states that the Casino in the gardens at Chiswick, built in the same year, was "the first essay of his Lordship's happy invention." Campbell's claim was not denied or disputed at the time, nor, in fact, was any suggestion made that Burlington was the architect, until Walpole, who disliked Campbell (probably because his father had injured him), and whose accounts are habitually inaccurate, blandly assigned the design to Lord Burlington, ignoring Campbell's explicit statement, the only contemporary evidence in existence. We are therefore justified in concluding that Lord Burlington had nothing to do with the design of Burlington House beyond paying the bill, a remark which will be found to apply to his other designs.

The villa at Chiswick (1729), since altered, was avowedly a copy of Palladio's villa for Almerigo at Vicenza, which Campbell had already reproduced on a larger scale at Mereworth. It was not, therefore, an original design in any case; certain modifications had to be made,

[1] "Vitruvius Britannicus," vol. iii., pp. 22-26.

involving technical knowledge; and, as Campbell designed the villa at Mereworth before 1723, it is possible that he made the drawings for the Chiswick villa, or more probably Kent, who was now living with Lord Burlington and in his regular employment.[1] Brettingham states that Lord Charlemont was so enamoured of this villa at Vicenza that he was minded to imitate it on his estate in Ireland, yet Lord Charlemont has not been immortalized as an architect in consequence. The Westminster dormitory is a more crucial case; there is no doubt that Lord Burlington was connected with this building, but the question is, in what capacity? In Plate LI., vol. ii., of Kent's "Designs of Inigo Jones," the design of this dormitory, which was begun in 1722-23, is boldly claimed for Lord Burlington. In the All Souls' Collection, however, there exist various drawings[2] of this dormitory, dated January 14th, 1718-19, which place it beyond a doubt that the original design of this dormitory was by Wren, and that the existing building is only an inferior version of Wren's design carried out under Lord Burlington's directions. Wren's original design consisted of an open arcade rusticated in seventeen bays, with rectangular recesses over, and square windows above, surmounted by a cornice and parapet course. A variation is introduced in the design of the three centre bays, which are shown with rusticated pilasters, and circular openings with wreaths, instead of the square recesses of the remaining bays. It appears from the section that the whole of the ground floor was open to one side with a row of columns running down the centre. Burlington spoilt this design in execution, first by carrying it out in Bath stone, a material never used by Wren in London; and, secondly, by omitting two bays of the design, the parapet course, and the variation of treatment shown by Wren for the three centre bays, with the result that his façade is lame and monotonous, and the details altogether inferior to the large and

[1] The chief differences between the two are these: Mereworth is a square of about 90 ft, Chiswick 68 ft., and on the principal floor at Mereworth the central hall is circular, as in the original, and 35 ft. in diameter, as against an octagon of 26 ft. at Chiswick. Campbell provided a gallery at Mereworth, 82 ft. by 20 ft., and this space at Chiswick is occupied by three rooms *en suite*. In elevation Chiswick is the plainer of the two, it has only one portico as against four at Mereworth, and in Palladio's design. The attic storey over the entablature is omitted, and instead of the dome and cupola at Mereworth, Chiswick has a short octagonal drum with a flat dome, the only improvement on the original design. At Chiswick the steps are fatal to the design. Both in this and other details Campbell kept very much nearer to the original, and his is by far the better version of the two. The improvements suggested by the taste of the noble patron render the Chiswick villa a mere travesty of Palladio's design.

[2] Vol. iii., pp. 25, 26, 28, 31, 34.

generous manner of Wren.[1] It is clear from the Chapter House Records that Burlington undertook the direction of the actual building of the dormitory some four years after Wren's design was made and approved of; and it is further evident, from a comparison of the designs with the building, that he used his discretion very badly in allowing himself to tamper with Wren's design. Lord Burlington occupied a position analogous to that of a chairman of a building committee, and this is probably the only foundation for the tradition that he designed the York Assembly Rooms, which were built when he was lord-lieutenant of the county. Drake ("Eboracum," 1736, dedicated to Lord Burlington) says, "the design was given by that truly English Vitruvius, Richard, Earl of Burlington, from Palladio." Lord Burlington probably suggested the design of the Egyptian Hall, given in Palladio, as a suitable model. Kent, or Leoni, got out the drawings,

[1] I am enabled, by the courtesy of Dr. Rutherford and Mr. St. Clare Bedford, to give the following account of the events which led to the building of the Westminster dormitory. This account is based on a series of extracts relating to the school, compiled by the late Dr. Scott from the Chapter House Records. In 1708 Sir Edward Hannes left £1,000 for a lodging for the forty king's scholars where directed by the Dean and Chapter, "in contriving whereof he desired Sir Christopher Wren and Dr. Aldrich (since deceased) should be consulted." In 1711 the Lord Chancellor ordered that Wren should be consulted as to the designs of the new building. The legacy proved insufficient, and Wren at first advised the repair of the existing building, and in 1713 the Lord Chancellor ordered that Wren's report be carried out; but in 1714 the Dean and Chapter determined on building the new dormitory on the west side of the gardens on the existing site from designs by Wren. Nothing was done till 1718 for want of funds, and, on a petition made to the crown for aid, the king gave £1,000 and the Prince of Wales £500 towards the building; and it was finally settled by a majority of three, on June 14th, 1719, that the dormitory should be begun, and the scholars were removed to Chiswick. But a new obstacle had now intervened. Dr. Friend, the head master, objected to the building as encroaching on the gardens and blocking his view, and in 1719 brought an action against the Dean and Chapter praying for a perpetual injunction to restrain the building. On this the Dean and Chapter altered the plan in various respects to meet the objections of Dr. Friend. Finally, in 1723, the Lords referred the matter back to the Dean and Chapter, who decided to build on the garden site, and the work appears to have been begun before 1723. Wren died in February, 1723, and the matter had already passed into Lord Burlington's hands, for on January 1st, 1723, it was resolved "that Dr. Brodrick do wait on the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Burlington, and in the name of the Dean and Chapter return their humble thanks to his Lordship for the care and trouble he has already taken in building the college dormitory, and desire his Lordship to proceed with the same according to his Lordship's plan"—his lordship's plan being no other than Wren's design. Burlington appears to have acted as treasurer. On January 18th, 1723, he informed the Dean and Chapter that he held £1,320 13*s.* 6*d.*, part of money collected by the late Dean for the work, and in 1726 £1,586 16*s.* 4½*d.* was still owing to the workmen. In 1733 it was ordered that the dormitory be finished by direction of the Committee.



SECTION OF MEREWORTH CASTLE, KENT.

(Vitruv. Brit. III., 38)

Campbell

[to face p. 226



WREN'S DESIGN FOR THE NEW DORMITORY, WESTMINSTER. ALL SOULS' COLLECTION.

and Lord Burlington directed the builder, and gave a handsome subscription towards the building.

So far from its being true that Lord Burlington was generous enough to allow to Campbell and Kent the credit of his own designs, the evidence is exactly to the contrary, that Campbell and Kent, in their capacity as paid architects, were content to allow Lord Burlington to trade on their reputations, and in their zeal for his service to claim for him designs which were no more made by Lord Burlington than they were by Campbell or Kent. No authentic drawings by Lord Burlington have yet been produced, and in the absence of any such evidence, and in view of the facts already advanced, one is justified in concluding that he was no more an architect than any other of the noble patrons of the eighteenth century. But Lord Burlington was at least munificent in his support of architecture. About 1715-16 he induced Giacomo Leoni, a Venetian architect, to come to England to superintend an edition of Palladio, which was published in London, 1715-16, and it is quite possible that at about this time Leoni designed the colonnade connecting the offices with the street wall of Burlington House. This colonnade, as I have mentioned before, Campbell either designed himself or found in existence at the time. Leoni stayed in England till his death in 1746, and carried out various buildings, of which the most important were Moor Park[1] in Hertfordshire, built at a cost of £150,000 in 1720, Moulsham in Essex, and Lathom House, Lyme Hall, and Bold Hall in Lancashire, Burton Park in Sussex (destroyed 1862), and Clandon in Surrey. In 1726 he translated and published the architecture of Alberti in three volumes, with twenty-seven additional plates of his own. These include a triumphal arch for Hyde Park, the great house at Carshalton designed for Thomas Scawen, in which the columns of Corinthian order were to be 3 ft. 6 in. in diameter and 30 ft. high, the Duke of Queensberry's house in Burlington Gardens,[2] a small house in the King's Road, Chelsea, and some other designs for houses which apparently were never carried out.

It is probable that the actual designs attributed to Lord Burlington were made either by Leoni, Campbell, or Kent. Burlington also provided the money for Kent's publication of the designs of Inigo Jones in

[1] Moor Park was designed by Leoni for Mr. Benjamin Styles, who bought the property from the Countess of Buccleugh, and made his architect build his new stone house, outside and encasing the older brick house built for the Duke of Monmouth. The walls are said to be 7 ft. to 8 ft. thick. The south wing and the colonnades of Leoni's design were pulled down by Mr. Thomas Ross who held the property in 1785. I am indebted for this information to some notes collected by Lady Ebury.

[2] Destroyed in 1792. Britton and Pugin, i. 80.



H. N. King, Photo.

MOOR PARK, HERTFORDSHIRE. Giacombo Leoni

Face p. 228.

1727, for Castell's "Villas of the Ancients" in 1728, and for a privately printed edition of Palladio's drawings for the restoration of the Roman Thermæ in 1730. Walpole had a free and easy way of assigning buildings to people who, by their want of training, could not possibly have had the knowledge necessary to carry them out. Thus he claims for Lord Pembroke, who died in 1751, the design of the Palladian Bridge at Wilton, and other buildings. The bridge was actually designed by Morris. Both Lord Pembroke and Lord Burlington were probably men of taste, and given to making those suggestions which the amateur is apt to regard as tantamount to an architectural design. But a subject for a picture is hardly the same thing as the picture itself, and the merely amiable intelligence which is fertile in architectural suggestion is very far removed from the capacity to realize these suggestions in actual building. *A priori*, and having regard to the extreme difficulty of modern architecture, it is certain that such knowledge as may be acquired by travel, and the admiration of buildings, even when joined to a real interest in the art, will not enable the most gifted amateur to design and successfully execute even a correct academical exercise in building. The amount of practical and technical knowledge necessary to such a comparatively simple matter as this is very much greater than the layman imagines, and this opinion is fully borne out by one or two conspicuous failures which have occurred within the last fifty years when amateurs have made a serious attempt at architecture. If buildings of good proportion and correct detail are assigned to amateurs, one may be pretty nearly certain that the name of the real architect has been withheld. In the study of English eighteenth century architecture additional caution is necessary, for the want of good faith among these book compilers and architects is one of the least satisfactory features of the first half of the eighteenth century.

William Kent was one of those generally accomplished persons who can do everything up to a certain point, and nothing well. Walpole says, "he was a painter, an architect, and the father of modern gardening. In the first character he was below mediocrity, in the second he was a restorer of the science, in the last, an original and the inventor of an art that realizes painting and improves nature." We are here only concerned with his work as an architect and designer.[1] Kent was born

[1] I may refer the reader to some account of Kent's influence on garden design in the "History of the Formal Garden in England." Blomfield and Thomas (Macmillan, 1892). A description of his work is to be found in Walpole's "Essay on Gardens" and "The Beauties of Stowe." London, 1753.

at Rotherham in Yorkshire in 1684, and began his career as an apprentice to a coach-painter in Yorkshire. He came to London early in the eighteenth century, and, through the generosity of certain gentlemen of Yorkshire, was enabled to travel in Italy. In 1713 he gained the prize given by the Pope for painting at Rome, and probably soon afterwards was introduced to Lord Burlington, who was there making the grand tour with all the enthusiasm of the young amateur. Burlington seems to have formed an extravagant estimate of Kent's capacity as an artist, and in 1719 took him back with him to Burlington House, where he allowed him to reside till his death in 1748. Kent's earliest works were portraits. He was employed to paint the ceilings at Houghton, at Lord Townsend's house at Rainham, and at Kensington Palace. He was also employed at Stowe and Wanstead; and, as Walpole points out, all that he did in the way of painting was exceedingly bad. Sir Robert Walpole judiciously confined him to monochrome at Houghton, but he allowed him to design the mantelpiece and ornamentation of the ceilings. It does not appear, indeed, that Kent ever received any specific training in architecture. He began as a painter and continued as a designer of ornament of every kind, and this may perhaps account for the extreme uncertainty of his work. It was not till he entered Lord Burlington's service that he took up architecture. He probably made the drawings for most of the buildings attributed to Burlington, as already suggested; and the latter used his influence to obtain for Kent various official appointments, such as the post of Master Carpenter of all his majesty's works, in which he succeeded Ripley in 1726. Lord Burlington's great reputation as a *virtuoso* speedily made Kent the most fashionable architect of his day. Walpole says that two great ladies begged him to design their birthday gowns: "the one he dressed in a petticoat decorated with columns of the five orders, the other like a bronze, in a copper-coloured satin with ornaments of gold." His designs for furniture and the handicrafts in general were about equally inappropriate. Some, however, of Kent's architectural designs are by no means wanting in distinction. They are severely, almost pedantically, simple, their proportions are good, and Kent avoided the heavy-handed touch which spoilt the work of some of his contemporaries. Probably the best piece of work that Kent ever did is the temple of "Ancient Virtue" in the Gardens of Stowe, a circular room with a peristyle of the Ionic order. The best examples of his manner are the façade of the Treasury Buildings to St. James's Park, 1734, Holkham in Norfolk, Devonshire House, Piccadilly, built in 1734, and the

H. Applegate, Photo.

HOLKHAM, NORFOLK. Kent

Face p. 230.



PLAN OF HOLKHAM. Kent.

(Vitruv. Brit. V., 65)

[to face p. 230

L. Varney & Son, Buckingham, Photo. *Face p.* 230.

TEMPLE IN STOWE PARK.

Kent. by Gibbs.

Horse Guards, begun in 1742. The portico to Devonshire House is a later addition, quite out of harmony with Kent's design. The elevation (given in "Vitruvius Britannicus," iv. 20) shows a wide landing, on an arcade in three bays, the height of the basement storey and the full width of the three centre bays, with stairs to right and left. This staircase gave the necessary weight to the centre of the composition, and when it was removed the whole gist and intention of Kent's design was destroyed. The scale of the façade, as it now stands, has been still further injured by the removal of the original glazing. The plan of the house is bad, and the staircases very ill-contrived; probably this is accounted for by Kent's slight familiarity with the practical requirements of house architecture; but the elevation, though not particularly original, is quiet and dignified, and less unreasonable than most of the ambitious architecture of the time. Holkham, though unattractive, is at least original. The general plan consists of a rectangular block containing the principal rooms, with four smaller detached blocks connected by passages at the angles with the main block. The north front has a monotonous repetition of Venetian windows, both fronts are overburdened by the expanse of bare wall above the windows to the principal floor, and the wings are curiously ugly.

Kent was more successful with the Horse Guards, one of the best Palladian designs of the eighteenth century; its only fault is a possible affectation of size not borne out by the scale of the actual building, but its grouping is exceedingly good, and in spite of the baldness of detail, the general outline is very picturesque. Curiously enough, this building is one of the latest of Kent's designs. It was not completed at the time of his death, and was finished by Vardy. Its manner is intended for Palladianism in its most rigorous development; yet at the same time, Kent was making barbarous designs in what he supposed to be the Gothic manner, which are remarkable only for their ignorance of Gothic, and the total disregard of the restraint and austerity of line, necessary to any architectural design whatever. Various instances will be found in "Some designs by Mr. Inigo Jones and Mr. Wm. Kent," published by Vardy in 1744; these designs show not the slightest knowledge of Gothic architecture, and little or no regard for the materials in which they were to be executed. A designer who could permit himself such folly as this is hardly to be taken seriously; and though Kent, as he showed at the Horse Guards and Devonshire House, undoubtedly possessed capacity as a designer, he was not a man of strong convictions. He evidently did not believe in his own work, but

was prepared to design in any manner that satisfied the fashion of his time. Though capable of designing fair Palladian architecture, he was equally ready to turn out some of the most childish and barbarous versions of Gothic ever perpetrated in this country, for no other reason than that the *virtuosi* were already becoming interested in experiments in Gothic architecture and regarded it as a favourable field for the artistic efforts of the amateur. In the same way, Kent, though acquainted with the fine tradition of garden design, of which Bridgeman was almost the last exponent, threw over this tradition absolutely, and set himself to lay out gardens and grounds with studied disregard of the building which must in any case give the grounds their *raison d'être*. Without entering here into any discussion of this method, I may point out that hitherto the house and grounds had always been considered as parts of one complete composition in strict relation to each other, and that it was only in obedience to the literary fashion for a sort of spurious romanticism, and an extremely self-conscious sensibility to the beauties of nature, that Kent turned his back on the old tradition, with results as disastrous as his ventures in Gothic architecture. In his eclecticism (in this regard only another term for absence of artistic conviction) Kent anticipated one of the worst tendencies of modern English architecture. He was not bound by the tradition of the long line of able English architects who had preceded him, he did not even follow the scholastic pedantry of Campbell, who at least had knowledge of his art. Nor again had he any distinctive individuality of his own, such as Vanbrugh and Hawksmoor undoubtedly possessed. The key to his variations of manner is to be found in the fashion of the time. Kent was the obedient servant of his public, and his public appears to have been rather frivolous and very ignorant.

Wilson, Aberdeen, Photo.

THE HORSE GUARDS.

Face p. 232.

CHAPTER X.

GIBBS, WARE, FLITCROFT, VARDY, THE WOODS OF BATH, DANCE THE ELDER.

FOR chronological reasons, and on account of their association with Lord Burlington and with each other in various works, it has been necessary to deal with Campbell, Ripley, and Kent before giving an account of Gibbs. The latter, however, is in every way a more important figure in the history of English architecture, and to a certain extent occupies an independent position. He owed nothing to the somewhat overpowering patronage of Lord Burlington, and in much of his work he definitely resumed the tradition of Wren, herein parting company with his contemporaries, who showed no disposition whatever to follow Wren's lead. Either on this ground, or to please Lord Burlington, or from personal jealousy, neither Campbell nor Kent make any reference to Gibbs's work.

The materials, indeed, for an account of Gibbs are very scanty, and consist mainly of the volumes which Gibbs published himself of his own works, and a MS. in the Soane Museum, entitled "A Few Short Remarks on Some of the Finest Ancient and Modern Buildings in Rome and Other Parts of Italy, by Mr. Gibbs," etc., made for his own use about 1707, followed by a short account of Gibbs, apparently by some one who knew him well. The account, however, is not entirely accurate, as it attributes to Gibbs the front colonnade of Burlington House. James Gibbs was born in Aberdeenshire in 1682, and was the younger son of a respectable family. He travelled to Holland, thence to Paris, and finally to Rome, where he studied under C. Fontana the younger, a pupil of Bernini, and probably became known as a draughtsman to the various English noblemen visiting Rome. On his return to England in 1709 he was helped by the Duke of Argyll,[1] Lord Mar, Wren, and others, and was appointed one of the surveyors to the

[1] In his dedication of his book of architecture, 1728, to the Duke of Argyll, Gibbs refers to "the early encouragement I received from your grace in my profession, upon my return from Italy, and the honour of your protection ever since."

commission appointed by the Act of 1708 to build fifty churches. In this capacity he designed the Church of St. Mary-le-Strand, 1714-17. Gibbs says that this was the first public building he was employed on after his return from Italy, "which being situated in a very publick place, the Commissioners for building the fifty Churches (of which this is one) spared no cost to beautify it." The north and south elevations have two orders, with lights in the upper order, the lower one being solid, in order to keep out the noise of the traffic. The double order of the elevations, the treatment of the windows, and the semicircular apse at the east end, show unmistakably Wren's influence. Gibbs had in his consciousness certain characteristic features of St. Paul's, and his introduction of these features in so small a building as St. Mary-le-Strand defeated its own object, for the building, if anything, looks smaller than it is. A statue of Queen Anne was to have been placed over the circular porch at the west end, but this was omitted. Gibbs's original idea had been to have a small campanile to the church, and at 80 feet westwards a column 250 feet high, in honour of Queen Anne. His design was approved, and the stone brought on to the site. But before this was built Queen Anne died, the idea was given up, and Gibbs was ordered to design a steeple instead of the campanile, in spite of the fact that the building was already 20 feet up on the original plan, and "therefore admitting of no alteration from east to west, which was only 14 feet," that is, the square of the original campanile. Gibbs was accordingly obliged to spread the tower from south to north, "which makes the plan oblong which should have been square." He got over the difficulty by a most skilful use of detached pillars on the north and south sides, and engaged pilasters on the east and west. All the details of this church show extreme care and thoughtfulness, but they are somewhat overcrowded, and the design, as a whole, is wanting in breadth and simplicity. Campbell's remarks on the "trifling, licentious, and insignificant ornaments, so much affected by some of our moderns," and various other abuses in architecture, probably refer to this Church of St. Mary-le-Strand, recently completed,[1] and, in spite of their snappish

[1] "Vitruvius Britannicus," vol. ii., p. 27. After pointing out the merits of the "design for Church of my invention," he proceeds: "The antients placed their chief beauties in the justness of the intercolumniations, etc. . . . nor have we one precedent either from the Greeks or Romans that they practised two orders, one over another, in the same temple in the outside, even on the most considerable, much less to divide it into little parts; and whereas the Antients were contented with one continued Pediment from the Portico to the Postico, we have now no less than three in one side, where the Antients never admitted any. This practice must be imputed, either to an entire Ignorance of



ST. MARY-LE-STRAND.

temper, have rather more reason than most of his criticisms. In 1719 Gibbs completed the steeple of St. Clement Danes from the entablature below the clock upwards, a very successful addition to Wren's work, and in 1721 he was employed to design the Church of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, on the whole the finest of his works.

Gibbs made two designs for this church. The first was for a circular church, 95 feet in diameter, which he preferred himself, but which was rejected by the commissioners on the ground of expense; the other design is the one actually carried out, at a cost of £32,000, between 1721 and 1726. The interior consists of a nave with an elliptical ceiling, which Gibbs preferred to the semicircular, as being better for sound, though less beautiful, and side aisles with shallow domes over each bay. The plaster work was executed by Gibbs's favourite Italians, Signori Artari and Bagutti. It is an effective and dignified interior in Wren's manner, and very well adapted for its purpose. Fergusson criticises the portions of the entablature over the detached columns, and makes the ridiculous suggestion that they would be better upside down. Fergusson was not a practical architect or he would have seen the futility of his suggestion. The extreme projection of the cornice of the entablature when reversed above the abacus of the capital would be perfectly absurd. The question, however, of the use of detached portions of an entablature above columns in cases of this sort is one of considerable technical difficulty. Their use seems unreasonable, and the straightforward simplicity of arcades such as those of St. Catherine Cree is more satisfactory from every point of view. But it may also be desirable to introduce a complete entablature in an interior for purposes of architectural effect, and if the church has a nave and aisles separated by an arcade on detached columns, either the entablature will not work out, or it has to be treated as Gibbs treated it in St. Martin's-in-the-Fields. The solution to this problem seems to be to abandon not the entablature, but the arcade, and to treat the entablature as a lintol, either from column to column, as at Christ Church, Newgate Street, or from the column to the outer walls of the aisle, as at St. James's, Piccadilly. In both of these churches the use of the entablature is perfectly justified on constructive grounds, and it is noticeable that where Wren omitted the entablature and brought the plaster groining right down on the top of the abacus, as at St. Andrew's by the Wardrobe, the effect is barren and almost mean.

Antiquity, or a Vanity to expose their absurd novelties, so contrary to those excellent precepts in Vitruvius, and so repugnant to those admirable remains the Antients have left us."



DETAIL OF THE WEST END OF ST. MARTIN'S-IN-THE-FIELDS.

The exterior of St. Martin's is very boldly designed. The single order is simpler and more effective than the double order of St. Mary-le-Strand, and the great spire and portico at the west end form a composition not unworthy of Wren himself. Fergusson is again severe in his condemnation. The spire he allows to be "in itself not objectionable; but not only," he says, "does it appear unmeaningly stuck through the roof, but over so open a portico has a most crushing and inharmonious effect;" and, with his usual facility in improving the designs of distinguished architects, he suggested that the spire should have been placed alongside. The answer is simple: that such was not Gibbs's intention, and that he was attempting another problem, namely, that of combining a steeple with a portico. Gibbs, a master in the designing of spires and steeples, scarcely inferior to Wren himself, knew perfectly well what was required in a spire. To Plate XXXI. of his book of architecture he wrote, "steeples are indeed of a Gothic extraction, but they have their beauties when their parts are well disposed, and when the plans of the several degrees and orders of which they are composed gradually diminish and pass from one form to another without confusion, and when every part has the appearance of a proper bearing." Gibbs was quite aware of the necessity of satisfying the eye as to constructive stability, and it is evident that he was fully conscious of what he was doing in placing his steeple where he did. From north-west and south-west, the points of view from which alone the composition of the steeple with the portico can be judged, the steeple stands fairly and squarely on its base. Moreover, it does not stand "over the portico," as is stated by Fergusson, who wrote on somewhat cursory impressions of buildings, but at the back of it; that is, the west wall of the tower is part of the solid wall at the back of the portico, and therefore the openness of the portico has nothing to do with the question. Fergusson's criticism is much too hasty. The phrase "stuck through the roof" might be technically correct if applied to a mediæval flêche, though it is a term that begs the question entirely. In the case of a tower and steeple, such as that of St. Martin's, the phrase is inexact and misleading, as is his expression of "astride of the roof." The roof is a flat-pitched roof, partially concealed by the balustrade, and only visible at a distance.

In 1721-24 Gibbs designed St. Peter's, Vere Street, and in 1725 the nave of All Hallow's Church, Derby. Marylebone Chapel dates from 1741. From 1722 onwards Gibbs was constantly employed at Cambridge. In this year he designed the Senate House which was intended



Frith & Co., Photo.

THE SENATE HOUSE, CAMBRIDGE.

Face p. 238.

Wilson, Aberdeen, Photo.

THE SENATE HOUSE, CAMBRIDGE.

Face p. 238.

to form the right-hand block of a three-sided court, of which the Royal Library was to occupy the centre, and the Consistory and Register Office the left-hand side. The Senate House was finished in 1730, Artari and Bagutti being again employed on the plaster work. The rest of the scheme was not carried out, possibly on account of the acrimonious division of opinion as to whether the three sides were to be attached or detached at the angles. Gibbs, in a letter dated 1728, gave five reasons for attaching the sides; and in 1729 James wrote from Greenwich Hospital urging that they should be kept detached. The library was ultimately built from a design by Wright, 1754-58. In 1723 Gibbs was called in to design the new buildings at King's, Cambridge. A design and a model for this had already been obtained in 1713-14 by Adams, the provost. This design was made by Hawksmoor, acting under Wren's supervision, but nothing was done; and when Adams died, in 1719, Hawksmoor's scheme was dropped. Gibbs's design consisted of a quadrangle, 240 ft. by 282 ft., of which one side was already occupied by the chapel. Each side was detached with a free space of 20 ft. at the angles, Gibbs giving as his reasons (1) that his buildings were different in style from the chapel, and (2) that the plan would diminish the risk of fire. The west side only was completed, and in 1824 the college resolved to complete the quadrangle and to Gothicize Gibbs's buildings. The south side, and the screen on the east side, were built from designs by Wilkins at a cost of about £100,000. Fortunately, however, Gibbs's block was left intact. No more signal instance can be found than this proceeding, of the folly of attempting to gratify archæological sentiment by building in a style of which the tradition has long been extinct. The real conflict and disagreement at King's is not between the chapel and Gibbs's dignified Palladian design, but between the chapel and Wilkins's feeble travesty of its style. Gibbs was too good an artist to challenge comparison with such a magnificent masterpiece as the chapel of King's.

By a curious coincidence Gibbs again superseded Hawksmoor at Oxford. When Dr. Radcliffe left his bequest to the university, Hawksmoor prepared the first design for the library. His design was not adopted, and the building was begun from a design by Gibbs in 1737 and completed in 1747. Gibbs probably considered this building his finest work. He published a complete set of the drawings in the "Bibliotheca Radcliviana" in 1747, and no expense was spared in the execution of the work which is probably the best built building in

Oxford.[1] The walls are of most massive stonework, and Gibbs records that the trusses to the great lead dome are all of heart of oak, "being an excellent piece of carpentry well-considered and executed in the best manner, the ends of the Timbers being fixed in shoes of metal to preserve them from any damp that might affect them from the stone." With the same faith as Wren, Gibbs was determined that his work should stand to eternity, so far as good building could insure it. The design consists of a great rotunda with a rusticated plinth, above which are sixteen pairs of engaged Corinthian columns, carrying a continuous entablature and a balustrade with pedestals and urns above the columns. The great sweep of the unbroken entablature, and the largeness of conception displayed throughout this building, show that Gibbs, at his best, had some of Wren's happy faculty of designing in the grand manner. Set back a distance of 17 ft. 6 in. from this balustrade comes an upper circular storey which forms the drum of the dome. This storey has eight buttresses 5 ft. thick, with a cornice, pedestal or blocking course, and urns above the buttresses; and above the blocking course springs the dome with eight ribs, surmounted by a small lantern and cupola with a great copper finial ball. The buttresses to the drum of the dome come between the pedestals above the lower order, instead of opposite them; a bold variation on conventional design fully justified in perspective. The general plan is exceedingly simple. An oval staircase reaches the first floor, and small newel staircases communicate with the galleries which run round the circular space beneath the dome.

Gibbs's inferiority to Wren is evident in the interior of the building. The drum of the dome starts from an unbroken entablature on modillions, and the arcade under this entablature is circular in plan, with the result that the arches are in-winding, and the mitres to the returns of the entablature are violently exaggerated. Moreover, the pilasters to the drum of the dome are out of proportion to the small Ionic order of the arcade below; and Artari's plaster work is rococo and florid to the last degree. Gibbs had a great admiration for the

[1] In the "Bibliotheca Radcliviana," Gibbs gives the names of the tradesmen employed: W. Townsend of Oxford, and Smith of Warwick, were the masons; Townsend, junior, the stone-carver; Linel of Long Acre, wood-carver; Artari, plasterer and fret-worker; Rysbrack, sculptor; Philipps, carpenter; Devall, plumber, and Blockley, locksmith. There was no general contractor for the works, but each trade was taken as a separate contract. This system still prevails in Scotland and the north of England. As usual the Portland stone has stood perfectly, whereas the rest of the stonework is failing. Some of the stone urns have been replaced by terra-cotta imitations within the last few years, with disastrous effect.

Frith & Co., Photo.

KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

Face p. 240.

Wilson, Aberdeen, Photo. *Face p.* 240.

RADCLIFFE LIBRARY, OXFORD.

"fretwork" of Artari and Bagutti, which reflects little credit on his taste, whereas he seems to have taken for granted the admirable architectural carving both in wood and stone which he could always command in English workmen. The carving to the balustrades, entablatures, and consoles of the gallery in the Radcliffe, is an excellent example of English wood-carving of the eighteenth century. Wren's influence is evident in the general design of the Radcliffe, and in fact it is very probable that Gibbs took his idea from Wren's design for the mausoleum to Charles I.

Of Gibbs's domestic work the most important examples are Ditchley in Oxfordshire, built for Lord Litchfield, and Milton House near Peterborough, for Lord Fitzwilliam. The plans, which are given in Gibbs's "Book of Architecture," show the total disregard of comfort usual in eighteenth century planning, but on the other hand, for purposes of display, they are fully as effective and quite as reasonable as the plans of Campbell and James. Gibbs was extensively employed in designing additions and alterations to houses in and about London, as at Twickenham for Mr. Secretary Johnson and Mr. C. Ogle, and at Isleworth for Sir John Chester, and for pavilions and temples in parks, as at Hackwood and Stowe. The description of the pavilion which he designed for Sir John Cooper near Derby is typical, "a cube of 20 feet, adorned with 3 Venetian windows, circular niches for Bustos, and an entablature supported by Rustick coines." No gentleman's place in fact was considered complete without a temple adorned with Bustos, entablatures, and "rustic coines." In 1730 Gibbs designed the quadrangle of St. Bartholomew's, Smithfield, probably with the Westminster dormitory, the earliest instance of the use of Bath stone in London. He presented the design to the hospital gratis. In 1733 he published a series of sixty-four plates with letterpress, entitled "Rules for drawing the several parts of Architecture," a complete manual of instruction in architectural design, which must have had much influence on the architecture of the time, and been invaluable as a pattern book to builders and amateurs.[1] Gibbs was probably the most learned architect of his time, and his learning was at once his strength and his weakness, for if it saved him from errors of scholarship (from which indeed Wren was not exempt); it also hampered his invention and led him to substitute knowledge for thought. He did not attempt new combinations. Unlike Hawksmoor he shrank from those bold experiments which are perhaps

[1] An account of this book will be found in chapter xiii.

impossible of attainment, and yet from their individuality and courage will always be more attractive than the commonplaces of correct design.

Gibbs's "Book of Architecture" (1728) contains his various designs for monuments at Westminster Abbey, Bristol, Bolsover, and Warwick. The Duke of Newcastle's is perhaps the finest. These designs and the miscellaneous designs for cartouches, sarcophagi, vases, and the like, contained in his book, are usually correct and scholarly, but though they escape the vulgarity of Kent they are wanting in individuality. Gibbs's natural taste in ornament seems to have been poor. His interest in decorative design was academical, that is to say, he was content to reproduce the accepted ornament of his time without regard to its actual suitability, and without any attempt on his own part to design ornament for a specific purpose and with a specific meaning. In this regard his art was barren, and no further developments could grow out of it. His real superiority to the other architects of his time lay in the proper province of architecture, in the power, that is, of conceiving of a building as a whole, and as an affair of large planes and masses, and of carrying it through to completion without failure in scale, or lapses into insignificance. No other English architect since the beginning of the eighteenth century has met Wren on equal terms on his own ground, as Gibbs undoubtedly did in his Church of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields. Gibbs died in 1754, and with him the last trace of Wren's tradition in official architecture.

Yet the eighteenth century has a remarkable record in architecture. Though Gibbs stood by himself, Isaac Ware, Wood of Bath, and even Flitcroft, were not inferior to Campbell and Ripley, and behind these again stood architects of undoubted ability, such as Vardy and Paine, and Chambers, the last and stoutest champion of the older school. Ware was a voluminous writer as well as an architect. In 1735 he published plates of Houghton Hall with Ripley and Kent, and of Rookby Hall in Yorkshire, and in the same year fifty-three plates of designs by Inigo Jones and others, a work of small value, and very inaccurate in regard to the work of Inigo Jones. In 1737 he published designs for the Mansion House, and in 1738 a translation of the four books of "Palladio." In 1756 he published a translation of Sirrigatti's practice of perspective, and an important manual of architecture, under the title of "A Complete Body of Architecture," some account of which will be found in chapter xiii. It is not known how Ware was educated. The story is that he was the son of a chimney-sweep, and that, having been seen by a gentleman drawing before Whitehall, he was sent by



DITCHLEY, PLAN AND ELEVATION.

("Gibbs' Book of Architecture," pl. 39)

[to face p. 242



CHIMNEY-PIECES.

(From Ware's "Complete Body of Architecture.")

[to face p. 242



ELEVATION OF CHESTERFIELD HOUSE.

(From Ware's "Complete Body of Architecture," p. 61)

Ware

[to face p. 242

this unknown patron to Italy, early in the eighteenth century. His name appears in the list of subscribers to Kent's "Inigo Jones," in 1727. In 1728 he was appointed Clerk of the Works at the Tower, in 1729, Clerk of the Works at Windsor Castle, in 1735, draughtsman and clerk itinerant to H.M. Board of Works at Windsor and Greenwich. In 1733 he carried out some work at Laneborough House, on the site now occupied by St. George's Hospital; in 1749 he designed Chesterfield House, and he also made designs for Chicksand (1750) and Wrotham Park in Middlesex, 1754.[1] The Town Hall at Oxford, recently destroyed, was designed by Ware in 1754. He died in 1766. Chesterfield House, Mayfair, is the best known example of Ware's work. It had the usual arrangement of advanced wings on either side of the forecourt, with the main block in the centre, and the colonnades were rectangular, a variation on the usual quadrant. The main block is in three storeys, very simply treated, but of good proportion, and the details, as in all Ware's work, are well-designed and vigorous. The main staircase is to the right of the entrance hall, a somewhat unusual position in work of this date. The house, as it now stands, varies considerably from the original design, for the sides of the forecourt have been taken down and rebuilt. As shown in the "Vitruvius Britannicus," iv. 67, these consisted of a colonnade in ten bays, continuing the line of the front on either side of the house, with three bays on the return joining the blocks of buildings to the right and left of the forecourt, which comprised stables on the north side and servants' quarters on the south. The only remains of the original design are the central block, which has been added to, and the external staircase to the gardens at the back. The colonnades and the side wings have been taken down. The width of the forecourt has been contracted from about 180 feet to about 94 feet, and the colonnade has been partially rebuilt in a different position in twelve bays, with one at the end at right angles to the house on either side of the contracted forecourt. The design is thus very seriously mutilated, and no idea can be formed, from the house in its present state, of what its complete effect must have been, when the wings were standing, detached from the main block by the colonnade, and yet designed in subordination to it in scale, and with the clear intention of acting as a foil to the main block.

Ware's sympathies were evidently with his predecessors rather than

[1] "Vitruvius Britannicus," v. 45, 46.

with the rising school of the brothers Adam, and there is no trace in his work of the somewhat finikin manner of the latter. He was extensively employed in private houses in London and did work in South Audley Street, Burlington Gardens, Dover Street, Bruton Street, Hanover Square, Berkeley Square, and Albemarle Street, illustrations of which are to be found in his "Body of Architecture." One of the best examples of his manner is the house, No. 6, Bloomsbury Square, in which he died, and probably the adjacent house at the corner of Hart Street.[1] The design is quite admirable for its purpose: spacious, dignified and convenient, and in every way an excellent example of the direct masculine architecture of the first half of the eighteenth century. The house at the corner of Somerset Street and Orchard Street with a wide engaged pediment is another instance of about the same date, and is possibly by the same hand. Ware was a very able architect, especially in house-building, and his reputation has been undeservedly thrust into the background, partly owing to the brilliant success of the brothers Adam and Chambers, and partly owing to the change of taste which was losing touch of tradition and drifting away into a merely capricious eclecticism.

Flitcroft and Vardy were contemporaries of Isaac Ware, and Flitcroft at any rate enjoyed a distinguished reputation in his lifetime.[2] His career is characteristic of the eighteenth century. He was born in 1697, and in 1711 was apprenticed for seven years to a joiner. While working as a carpenter in Lord Burlington's house, 1717-18, he attracted the notice of his lordship, by breaking his leg, and from this time forward enjoyed the favour of Lord Burlington who, whatever his merits as an architect, was certainly a discerning and munificent patron. He was employed as a draughtsman in Kent's publication of "Designs of Inigo Jones," and appears to have prepared all the drawings for that work for Hulsbergh and Fourdrinier to engrave, Kent's labours apparently not extending beyond the easy chair of the editor. In 1726 Flitcroft was appointed clerk of the works at Whitehall and St. James's, and in the years following he held various official posts, succeeding Kent as master mason in 1748, and Ripley as controller of his majesty's works in England, on the death of the latter in 1758. Flitcroft held this appointment till his death in 1769. His earliest important work

[1] The design of 6, Bloomsbury Square, with its staircase in the centre, is referred to in chapter xiii.

[2] In the inscription at Teddington Church, put up by his son, he is described as "Sui temporis architecturæ facile princeps," a claim which posterity has not endorsed.



GROUND PLAN OF CHESTERFIELD HOUSE. (FROM WARE'S "ARCHITECTURE.")

was the Church of St. Giles-in-the-Fields 1731-33,[1] and he not only designed this church, but undertook the contract for pulling down the old church and building the new at a total cost of £10,026 15*s.* 9*d.* Probably Flitcroft's undoubted practical knowledge led to his employment in the dual work of architect and contractor, but such a circumstance was rare in the eighteenth century, and, in fact, since the days of Wren, there had scarcely been an instance of its occurrence in the case of an architect of first-rate reputation. The church itself is of moderate size, with a steeple 160 feet high. In its general lines it follows the precedent, set for city church-building by Wren and Gibbs, in fact it follows with small variations the general design of the spire of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, but its effect is rather forced and ungracious, and its design has none of the easy spontaneity which marks the work of the great seventeenth century master. Flitcroft also designed the Church of St. Olave, Tooley Street, in 1737-39, and the Church of St. John, Hampstead, in 1745-47, "while resident at Frognal, in a house afterwards called Montague Grove." His chief domestic works were Wentworth House in Yorkshire, built in 1740, and Woburn Abbey in Bedfordshire, 1747. Flitcroft published a large double page engraving of his design for Wentworth House at the end of Kent's folio of drawings by Inigo Jones. Whether any part of this was carried out I do not know, but the building in its present state differs materially from the original design. As shown in the original design on Flitcroft's engraving Wentworth House had a total frontage of 600 feet, consisting of a large central block with a hexastyle portico the full height of the building. This central block was raised one storey above the adjacent wings. To the right and left of these wings came lower blocks of buildings on a different scale, terminating in convex screen walls and square towers or pavilions at the end. The abrupt change shown in this design in scale is unsatisfactory. Flitcroft seems to have designed this building piecemeal, or rather to have pieced it together from other designs, for the great central block is a reproduction with slight variations[2] of Campbell's second design for Sir Richard Child at Wanstead; and Flitcroft has certainly not improved on Campbell's design wherever he has altered it. The lower blocks of buildings, at the sides, are reasonable enough as isolated designs. Flitcroft has here introduced the spreading pediment, first used in England to any great extent by Campbell. This

[1] Mr. Birch says this church was built by Flitcroft about 1719. I do not know on what authority.

[2] The cupola is omitted and some of the details are varied.

H. N. King, Photo.

SPENCER HOUSE. Vardy

Face p. 246.

pediment covers a two-storey façade, of which the width is exactly three times the height. Woburn Abbey was practically rebuilt by Flitcroft in 1747, and this may perhaps account for the quadrangular plan, which reverts to the rudimentary method of rooms ranged side by side in single thickness, with a corridor running past them on the side to the court. The elevation consists of a symmetrical front, with a rusticated basement, and projecting bays in the centre and at the ends, carried up above the rest of the buildings. The recessed fronts between these bays have a balustrade above the entablature, and a mansard roof. Flitcroft's design is solid and unaffected, but somewhat bald. His early training at the bench was no doubt invaluable on its practical side, but hardly adequate to refine and strengthen a rather dull imagination. All Flitcroft's designs suggest the builder's draughtsman rather than the architect.

Of John Vardy, his contemporary, little is known. He was a pupil and assistant of Kent's, and worked with the latter on the law court buildings at Westminster, and also at Whitehall. After Kent's death he completed the façade of the Horse Guards towards Whitehall, and designed the Court of King's Bench at Westminster in 1753. In 1762 he designed Lord Spencer's house, overlooking the Green Park. The plan is remarkably able, and in the ingenuity of its arrangement more modern than any plan of the time. Separate access is given to every room, and each room has a sidelight of its own from the open air, instead of having to depend on toplights, or borrowed lights from halls and staircases as in so many of the designs of this period. The front to the park has three rooms arranged *en suite*, but also provided with separate access. The façade consists of a rusticated first floor, raised on a narrow terrace with a rusticated front, and the principal floor has engaged columns in seven bays with an entablature of the Doric order, and a pediment over the five centre bays. The columns are spaced very wide apart, somewhere about 4 diameters, instead of the $2\frac{1}{4}$ to 3 recommended by Palladio; and this excessive width of the intercolumniations, together with the great spreading pediment, make the whole building look lower than its real height,[1] an effect still further increased by the narrowness of the terrace. This façade facing the park is, however, a fine composition, and except that the balusters are rather slight and overcrowded, the scale is well maintained throughout. The Portland stone figures were "masterly executed by the late ingenious Mr. Spang, statuary." The north façade, facing the street,

[1] The height, from the ground-line to the top of the balustrade, as taken by scale from the plate in "Vitruvius Britannicus," iv. 39, is 60 ft.

is much less successful. The effect is uninteresting, and the mouldings and details are coarsely designed. In justice to Vardy, however, it must be pointed out that this façade was never completed, as Vardy intended the projecting bay at the end, with its Venetian window, pilasters, and pediment on the first floor, to be repeated at the other end, and it is so shown in the "Vitruvius Britannicus," iv. 38. This second bay, however, was never built, and the single pilaster built to start it still further emphasizes its incompleteness. Vardy died in 1765. His only published work, "Some Designs by Mr. Inigo Jones and Mr. Wm. Kent," appeared in 1744. It includes some very bad designs, some of which are certainly by John Webb; and the thirty-three designs by Mr. William Kent range from the Court of King's Bench to a candlestick and two dish-covers. Vardy appears to have possessed capacity as an architect, but his taste was indifferent and the range of his imagination limited.

Wood of Bath is in every way a more interesting figure. He was born in Yorkshire, and began his career at Bath as a road surveyor in 1727. Till his death, in 1754, he was extensively employed in Bath and the neighbourhood, and the modern city of Bath owes all its finest qualities to John Wood and his son, and the generous enterprise of Ralph Allen. To these men, moreover, was due the revival of the Bath stone quarries, which have sent out some of the best and some of the very worst stone in the kingdom, and have to a large extent superseded the fine Portland stone employed by Wren and his immediate successors. Wood's earliest works in Bath appear to have been the chapel court and church buildings in Bath, Eagle House, Bathford, in 1727, St. John's Hospital, in 1728, and the north side of Queen's Square, begun in 1729. It has been claimed for Wood that in this façade, the Circus, and north and south parades, he was "the first architect who conceived and carried out the idea of uniting several distinct dwelling-houses in one grand architectural design."[1] Mr. Loftie also claims this distinction for Wood, but the claim does not seem to me to be well founded, for Inigo Jones had already anticipated him in his designs for the north and south sides of Covent Garden. Where Wood was really strong, and in this he fairly claims his place among the masters of English architecture, is in his conception of a city as a whole. He grasped the fact that to attain any dignity in a city it is not enough to put up picturesque buildings and to leave the arrangements of streets and squares to the exigencies of commerce.

[1] "Dictionary of Architecture," Article *Wood*.



Wilson, Aberdeen, Photo.

PRIOR PARK, BATH.

Face p. 248.

He saw the necessity of a far-seeing scheme of orderly distribution, which should bring important buildings into relation to each other by a wise generosity in open spaces and ample streets; and by singular good fortune he was able to lay his lines so surely as to leave Bath as it is to this day, the finest city in England. Wood's actual buildings in Bath are disappointing. They are rather small and almost weak in design, and not particularly refined in detail, and his best work is to be found in the magnificent house which he built for Ralph Allen at Prior Park, the total frontage of which is 1,300 ft. As it now stands it embodies certain additions, the east wing and a great lower staircase from the terrace having been added later, while the chapel was built on the site of the old west pavilion, in 1844, from the designs of J. J. Scoles; it is now occupied as a Roman Catholic College. The design consists of a centre block in three storeys, connected with the pavilions at the ends by a rusticated arcade in continuation of the ground storey to the centre. The first or principal floor has alternate circular and angular pediments above the windows. The second floor windows have plain architraves, and above is a complete Corinthian entablature and a balustrade. In the centre of the façade is a superb hexastyle portico with Corinthian columns, starting from the level of the first floor, and carried up to the entablature. The diameter of these columns is 3 ft. 1½ in., and, with the exception of the Venetian windows at the sides on the second floor, this large scale is maintained throughout the design. Something of the effect is no doubt due to the site at the head of a beautiful valley, but it is one of Wood's particular qualities that he had a keen eye for the possibilities of a site, and by taking full advantage of the natural fall of the ground at Prior Park, he succeeded in producing a façade which is unsurpassed in England in its dignity and distinction. Wood carried out several other important works at Bath and in the neighbourhood, including the Exchange at Bristol, Redland Court and the Exchange at Liverpool, on which he was occupied at the time of his death. His son, John Wood, junior, carried out his father's work and completed the Circus and Gay Street at Bath. In 1769-1771 he designed the Royal Crescent, which is elliptical in plan, and the New Assembly Rooms; and between the years 1757-1771 Buckland in Berkshire and Standlynch in Wiltshire were built from his designs.[1] The design of

[1] Both of these houses are given in the "Vitruvius Britannicus," iv. 90, 93, and v. 78-81.

Buckland is somewhat remarkable. The plan consists of a square block in the centre, containing on the principal floor a hall, dining-room, 23 ft. 9 in. by 31 ft. 6 in., drawing-room, 25 ft. 6 in. by 20 ft., a dressing-room, breakfast-room, and staircases, and to right and left run out narrow corridors connecting with octagonal buildings with square projecting bays, occupied respectively by the chapel and library. The elevation resembles Paine's manner rather than his father's, but young Wood seems to have found it difficult to escape from his father's plan, for the general arrangement both of this house and of Standlynch, is evidently based on that of Prior Park, though in both cases the elevation is very different. Young Wood died in 1782. Apart from their capacity as architects (and that of the elder Wood was very great) both men are interesting as illustrating the state of architecture in the country in about the middle of the last century. Both the Woods were provincial architects, and so far as is known, were not in touch with the brilliant architects then practising in London, yet their manner of design is hardly to be distinguished from that of the latter, and there is no suggestion of the technical inferiority in design which has to some extent characterized the work of provincial architects since their date. Carr of York is another instance. The explanation is to be found in the unhesitating adhesion which all these men gave to one specific manner of design. Every architect was expected as a matter of course to be thoroughly grounded in the details of Palladian architecture, and for the first fifty years of the eighteenth century it never occurred to an English architect to design in any other manner. The result might be a certain tameness and monotony, but it at least preserved architecture from the vulgarities of unmitigated ignorance.

George Dance the elder is an instance of the value of this tradition. Born in 1698, he was appointed "Clerk of the City Works" by the Corporation in 1733, and from this date till his death, in 1768, he was employed on various buildings in and about the city, notably the Mansion House, begun in 1739 and completed in 1753. Dance was certainly not a gifted, or even a learned architect, yet the vitality of the tradition under which he worked was strong enough to save him from gross errors of taste, and even to impress a certain dignity on the work of a man of very moderate natural abilities who was said to have begun his career as a shipwright. The Mansion House, which is his most important work, has its faults, and its details are very bad. It is inferior to the design made by Ware, which is given in his "Complete Body of Architecture," Plates L., LI. Yet Dance's design is not

Wilson, Aberdeen, Photo.

THE MANSION HOUSE, LONDON. Dance.

Face p. 250.

deficient in a certain robust energy: it loses nothing by comparison with the adjacent buildings, such as the Bank of England and the Royal Exchange. The Mansion House occupies an oblong rectangular site, with 100 ft. frontage, and extending southwards 225 ft. The principal floor consists of an entrance hall leading into two salons placed *en suite* and communicating with the Egyptian Hall, 90 ft. by 59 ft. at the back of the building. Rooms are arranged on either side of the entrance hall and salons. The front elevation consists of a basement storey supporting a Corinthian order with an attic storey and balustrade over, and a projecting portico in five bays in the centre. As originally built there was another storey constructed on the roof over the front block and over the Egyptian Hall, giving a total height of 101 ft. The south storey was removed by the younger Dance in 1796, and the front in 1842, very much to the advantage of the design, for these extraordinary attic storeys must have gone far to justify the hostile criticism which this building has invariably encountered. It is probable that Dance erected them in obedience to the instructions of the Court of Common Council. Britton and Pugin[1] quote a suggestive story in regard to the choice of the designs submitted for this building. When it was known that the Council had resolved to build the Mansion House, Lord Burlington sent them an original design by Palladio. Instead of discussing the plan, the Council inquired whether Palladio was a freeman of the city, and the question was finally closed by one of the councillors declaring that it was notorious that Palladio was a Papist, and therefore incapable of carrying out the work.

Dance's churches are unequal. His earliest work was St. Luke's, Old Street, begun in 1732. This was followed, 1736-1740, by St. Leonard's, Shoreditch, St. Matthias', Bethnal Green, in 1741, St. Botolph, Aldgate, 1749-50, and some additions to Faversham Church in 1754. Of these churches, that of St. Leonard's, Shoreditch, is the most successful. St. Botolph, Aldgate, is bald even to brutality, but in St. Leonard's, Dance caught a reflection of Wren's most admirable manner, and, in fact, must have consciously borrowed from St. Mary-le-Bow. The outlines of the two steeples are not very dissimilar, but in every case where Dance ventured on a new departure of his own he has lost the grace of the original; and though the tower is picturesque in outline and soundly constructed, it fails of attainment in the precise point at which Wren was so eminently successful. In Dance's design

[1] "Public Buildings of London," vol. ii., p. 121.

there is no cohesion between the lower stage, the tower that is, and the steeple over it. Where Wren kept his tower square and comparatively plain, and softened the transition from the round to the square with curious but most effective terminals, Dance has broken up the mass of his tower with engaged columns, and left the angles over them empty, except for some clumsy brackets which are quite inadequate to complete the outline. Dance's design is more elaborate than Wren's, yet every point of elaboration is a loss in the design—it bears no trace of that singular genius for proportion which raises Wren's work so high above the attainment of any of his successors.

Flitcroft, Dance, and Isaac Ware perhaps represent the last of the elder school of eighteenth century architects. The transition is fine and in some cases barely perceptible, yet I think a distinction may fairly be made between the generation which succeeded Wren, and which had more or less ceased to exist by the second half of the eighteenth century, and the next generation represented by Carr of York, the younger Dance, and Chambers on the one hand, and the Adams on the other, Paine, perhaps, presenting the exact point of transition between the two. John James died in 1746, Gibbs in 1754, Vardy in 1765, Ware in 1766, and Flitcroft in 1769. All these men followed the tradition of Inigo Jones, their architecture at its best was severe, almost forbidding in its grave abstention from ornament, and it adhered steadily to his precept in being "masculine and unaffected." Their immediate successors divided into two camps, represented on the one hand by Chambers, who, to all intents, belonged to the older school, and on the other, by the brothers Adam, and the innovators who endeavoured to refine upon the old tradition by the introduction of Greek and other motives. With this latter school, the eclectics as one may call them, quite modern architecture with all its disastrous experiment begins. Whatever the merits of these men, the ideal of Inigo Jones was not the mark at which they aimed. Their work is often graceful and accomplished, refined in proportions, and dexterous in ornament, but it is feminine in quality and steeped in affectation. One looks in vain in their work for the energy of intelligence, the strong contempt for prettiness, which even the inferior masters of the older school possessed in some degree. The elegance of the Adams was but a poor substitute for this great quality. Their art was essentially a morbid development, evidence of the slow decay that was surely overtaking the once magnificent school of English architecture.

ST. LEONARD'S, SHOREDITCH.

CHAPTER XI.

PAINE, MORRIS, TAYLOR, CARR OF YORK, CHAMBERS, GANDON, DANCE THE YOUNGER, ROBERT AND JAMES ADAM.

THE reputation of an artist is often an affair of accident. Though history rights itself in the long run, men have owed their eminence to fortunate circumstance, or adroit advertisement, and architects are more particularly liable to these caprices of fame, inasmuch as their works are stationary, that is, they cannot be exhibited in galleries, and their merits or demerits have to be taken on faith. Such a building, for instance, as the old Bethlehem Hospital, or the Town Hall at Abingdon, would not have disgraced the architect of Chelsea Hospital. Yet the names of their designers are unknown, and some of by no means the least attractive buildings of the eighteenth century are by unknown men. Few architects of the generation succeeding Ware and Flitcroft did better work than James Paine, yet in spite of his capacity and constant employment his reputation has been quite overshadowed by that of Robert Adam, partly because the latter invented a method of decoration which caught on to the fashion of the time, and has duly taken its place among other recent revivalisms, and partly because Adam was astute in advertisement, and was perfectly disposed to recognize in himself a genius of first-rate order.

Paine was born in 1716; he is said to have studied in the St. Martin's Lane Academy for drawing, and in the introduction to his published works he says that he began his studies under Mr. Thomas Jersey, and at the age of nineteen was allowed "to conduct a building of consequence in the West Riding," namely, Nostell Priory. The phrase is ambiguous, and does not necessarily imply that Paine designed this building, though it has always been reckoned among his works,[1] and Wolfe and Gandon expressly say it was designed and carried out by him. It is evident, however, that Paine was very early given important work to design. In the introduction to his folio on the Mansion House at

[1] The date of Nostell Priory is given as 1751. Either this date is wrong, or Paine must have written carelessly and from recollection only.



SECTION OF WORKSOP.

(J. Paine's "Plans, Elevations, &c.," II., 14)

[to face p. 254



GROUND PLAN OF GOSFORTH HOUSE. (FROM J. PAINE'S "PLANS, ELEVATIONS AND SECTIONS, ETC.," VOL. I.)

Doncaster, he says, "Having at that time (1744) the honour to be engaged on several gentlemen's buildings in that county, I was made choice of for their architect." Answorth in Yorkshire, begun in 1740, and Heath House (1744-5) seem to have been his earliest buildings, followed by the Doncaster Mansion House (1745-1748), Cowick Hall (1752), and Gosforth (1755) in Yorkshire, Dover House in Whitehall (1754-1758), Serlby in Nottinghamshire, Stockeld in Yorkshire, and the stables at Chatsworth (1758-1763). Between 1760 and 1770 Paine seems to have been engaged on nearly all the big houses then being built in England. In 1761 he prepared the first designs for Kedleston. The history of this house is singular; it appears that the original scheme had been furnished by Brettingham, from whose designs the north-east pavilion had already been built. Paine says that he adopted this design for the four pavilions or wings, but designed himself the central block and connecting corridors. In Paine's plan the main staircase is placed between the circular saloon and the great hall of columns; for some reason the work was taken out of Paine's hands and given to the Adams, who carried out the plans with certain modifications, but the credit of the original design belongs to Paine. His account of it is that finding himself too busy in other parts of England, he requested Lord Scarsdale to allow him to resign the work, "whereon it was intrusted to those able and vigorous artists, Messrs. Robert and James Adam." In 1761 the old Manor House at Worksop in Nottinghamshire was burnt to the ground, and in 1763 Paine was employed by the Duke of Norfolk to make designs for the re-building. Paine prepared plans on a magnificent scale. The general plan was quadrangular, about 305 ft. square, with two internal courts, divided from one another by the great Egyptian Hall, 140 ft., long by 70 ft. wide and 55 ft. high. The library, 206 ft. by 36 ft., occupied part of one of the outer sides of the quadrangle, and the plans also included a state bedroom with a peristyle of eight marble columns, and a drawing-room 130 ft. long, with an ante-room attached. The buildings were begun at once, but were stopped in the following year by the death of the duchess, when only the north front was completed. The plan was undoubtedly very able, and admirably arranged for great receptions. The south entrance gave into a hall 40 ft. by 50 ft., from which visitors passed into the "Tribune," a circular hall, top-lighted, 40 ft. in diameter, with a peristyle of eight columns; thence to the Egyptian Hall, and from this again to the main staircase on the north side. By this arrangement a vista was provided through the entire depth of the building. In 1763 Paine designed Thorndon Hall

R. Keene, Photo.

KEDLESTON HALL, DERBY. Paul & Adams.

Face p. 256.



SECTION OF KEDLESTON.

(Vitruv. Brit. IV., 51)

[to face p. 256


A. Hall ..... 69. 3 by 42. 0
B. Salon ..... 42. 0 diam.r
CC. Libraries ..... 36. 0 ... 24. 0
D. Drawing Room ..... 44. 0 ... 28. 0
E. Music Room ..... 36. 0 ... 24. 0
F. Dining Room ..... 36. 0 ... 24. 0
GG. Ante Rooms .....
H. Bed Chamber ..... 33. 0 ... 22. 0
I. Wardrobe .....
KKK. Corridores .....
L. Music Gallery ..... 66. 0 by 18. 0
M. Organ .....
N. Chapel ..... 36. 0 ... 18. 0
O. Greenhouse ..... 66. 0 ... 18. 0
P. Kitchen continued ..... 43. 0 ... 24. 0
Q. Laundry ..... 35. 0 ... 18. 0
R. Bed Chamber ..... 18. 0 Square
S. Lady Scarsdales Library ..... 24. 0 ... 18. 0
T. Dressing Room ..... 18. 0 Square
V. Lord Scarsdales Dressg. Room 24. 0 ... 16. 0
Plan of the Principal Floor of Kedleston.
Plan d'Etage Principal de Kedleston.
T. Garden del.r
T. Duke sculp.t

PLAN OF KEDLESTON.

(Vitruv. Brit. IV., 46)

[to face p. 256



FROM J. PAINE'S "PLANS, ELEVATIONS AND SECTIONS, ETC.," VOL. II.

in Essex for Lord Petre, and the house was begun in 1764 and finished 1769, in Portland stone and brick. He here reverted to the common eighteenth century plan of a large central block, with advanced quadrant colonnades running out to the two wings; the wings were designed as pavilions, containing on the left the kitchen and offices, and on the right the stables. In the basement of the central block separate rooms were provided for the chief butler, the house steward, and the housekeeper, besides dining halls for the servants, and tenants and a steward's parlour. The extent and completeness of Paine's plans for a nobleman's country house remind one indeed of the immense establishments of the sixteenth century. The saloon was on the first floor, 60 ft. by 30 ft. by 33 ft. high, very nearly the proportions of the Wilton room, and in order to allow for the height of this and the principal reception rooms Paine contrived a mezzanine storey for servants, 8 ft. high, above the smaller rooms. For Lord Petre he also designed a very skilfully planned house on an irregular site in Park Lane. In 1770-1776 he designed Wardour in Wiltshire, on much the same general scheme as Thorndon, with a centre block and advanced wings, but with a remarkable central hall 47 ft. in diameter, with a peristyle of the Corinthian order. In the four angles of the square in which the hall stands are half-domed niches; the hall as shown in Paine's design is top-lighted, and measures from the floor to the skylight 60 ft. Paine was rather fond of central staircases top-lighted; other instances occur at Axwell Park, Durham, Brocket Hall in Hertfordshire, and Gosforth. His latest works appear to have been Richmond Bridge (1780-83), bridges at Chertsey and Walton, and the beautiful bridge at Kew.

Paine was one of the most skilful house planners of the eighteenth century; his plans are, comparatively speaking, straightforward and convenient, and distinguished by a remarkable ability in grouping, that is to say, Paine was quick to see the possibilities of any given combination, the chances it afforded of fine vistas and perspectives, and skilful in providing for these in his plans without obviously straining after effect. His strength lay in this power of abstract architectural design, that is, design which depends for its effect not on ornament, but on relations of mass and the play of light and shade; in a word, on the legitimate language of architecture pure and simple. In regard to his elevations and ornament, Paine was not so happy; his taste was somewhat uncertain, and he never developed any very decided manner of his own. In Cowick Hall, an early work, with its pilasters and great overhanging cornice on modillions, he seems to have borrowed



NORTH FRONT OF THORNDON HALL, ESSEX.

(J. Paine's "Plans, Elevations, &c.," II., 25)

Paine

[to face p. 258



H. N. King, Photo.

KEW BRIDGE.

Face p. 258.

suggestions from some of Wakefield's houses, which were either designed or inspired by Vanbrugh. So again, in Serlby House, with its disproportionate pediments, he wavered between Archer and Ware; at Gosforth and elsewhere he seems to have caught from Kent a ridiculous mania for rows of finial balls ranged along the top of curtain walls, and he was by no means faithful to the orthodox Palladian tradition. The entablature to the front of Hare Hall in Essex is composed of a cornice and architrave with the frieze omitted, and the capitals to the angle pilasters of this façade show the hybrid details which Adam was rapidly making the fashion; while his ceilings abound in sphinxes, meaningless acanthus scrolls, and conventional stucco ornament. His best elevations were his plainest, such as the north fronts of Wardour and Thorndon, consisting of a rusticated basement and a plain façade, without either quoins or pilasters, and a simple cornice with a blocking course or balustrade above. Paine also designed Stapleton Park in Yorkshire, Shrubland Hall in Suffolk, buildings at Gibside, Bramham Park, and Forcet, and considerable alterations and additions at Cusworth in Yorkshire. He was one of the architects of the Board of Works, but lost this appointment after Burke's Reform Bill in 1782; and he was a member of the committee formed in 1755 to consider the organization of the Royal Academy, but on its formation in 1768 he was not elected a member, though in 1765 he had been chosen President of the Incorporated Society of Artists of Great Britain. Paine died in France in 1789, at the age of seventy-three, having outlasted the tradition under which he had learnt his art, and having lived to see the full development of that eclecticism against which, alike in practice and in writing, he had consistently protested.

His contemporary, Robert Morris, was more ambitious but less successful. Morris appears to have been born early in the eighteenth century, and was pupil to a kinsman, Roger Morris, principal engineer to the Board of Ordnance. His earliest work is said to have been Inverary Castle, begun in 1745 and finished 1761; this is a sort of Gothic, which is the more remarkable as Morris proposed to be a rigid purist in classical architecture, and realized his professions with the most complete ugliness in the central portion of the lodge built in Richmond Park for George II.; and again in the house at Hammersmith, built for Thomas Wyndham, and afterwards called Brandenburgh House (destroyed 1822). Morris also designed a house for Lady Suffolk at Twickenham, Coom Bank in Kent, Wimbledon House (destroyed 1785), and Kirby Hall in Yorkshire. The gallery in Mr. Wyndham's

house appears to have been his best piece of work; this measured 85 ft. by 20 ft., and was sumptuously decorated with frescoes and gilding and rare marbles. Two of the columns were monoliths of Sicilian jasper, 17 ft. high, and the columns to the doorcase were of lapis lazuli.[1] Morris also designed the Palladian bridge at Wilton, and published various books on architecture. His work, however, is uninteresting. He was fond of covering his buildings with a great pyramidal roof, set at a very low angle, omitting all parapets or blocking courses; and his originality is excessively dull. Morris is typical of the numerous architects of about the middle of the eighteenth century, who practised Palladian design with extreme assiduity and not a spark of genius. Sanderson, the architect of Kirtlington in Oxfordshire, a fine spacious design, and Stratton Park in Hants, the Hiorns who designed Foremark in Derbyshire and the County Hall at Warwick, and S. Wright, who worked with Morris, were all men of much the same class and attainments.

In his memoir of the life of Sir Wm. Chambers, Gwilt says that Paine and Sir Robert Taylor "nearly divided the practice of the profession between them . . . . till Mr. Robert Adam entered the lists." Taylor, as an architect, is far less interesting than Paine. His work is dull and heavy, unredeemed by originality, or even by the vigorous vulgarity which gives a certain quality to the works of the elder Dance. Taylor, who was the son of a stonemason, was born in 1714, and began his career as an apprentice in the yard of Sir Henry Cheere, the sculptor. He visited Rome before the middle of the eighteenth century, and on his return to England, was employed to carve the pediment to the Mansion House, possibly in pursuance of Lord Burlington's bitter remark "that any sculptor could do well enough for such a building as that." The Mansion House was completed in 1753, and it appears that at about this date, Taylor gave up sculpture for architecture. His earliest works seem to have been Stone Buildings in Lincoln's Inn Fields in 1756, and some alterations to Chilham in Kent. In 1759, in conjunction with Dance the city surveyor, he designed the large central arch of old London Bridge, to take the place of two of the older arches, and from this time forward he was extensively employed on various banking houses in the city, on the old Bank of England, and on various private houses, such as Gopsall Hall for Lord Howe, Ely House in Dover Street in 1772, Heveringham Hall in Suffolk, and on the various building estates to

[1] In "Vitruvius Britannicus," vol. iv., p. 28, 29, Servandoni is given as the architect.



SECTION OF WARDOUR HOUSE, WILTS.

(J. Paine's "Plans, Elevations, &c.," II., 40)

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY

[to face p. 260

which he was surveyor. He designed the bridge at Maidenhead in 1780. Taylor was architect to the Board of Works and surveyor to the Admiralty. He was knighted in 1782, and died in 1788, leaving the bulk of his large property as a legacy for the founding of the Taylorian institution at Oxford, perhaps on the whole his most solid claim to permanent distinction.

To Paine and Taylor, Gwilt should have added Carr of York, an architect who was extensively employed in the north of England between 1750 and the end of the century. Carr was born in 1723, and began as a working mason. Either as contractor or as clerk of the works, he built Kirby Hall in Yorkshire in 1750 from the designs of Morris, and shortly afterwards started in practice as an architect on his own account. No doubt his practical knowledge of masonry and construction gained him the confidence of his clients, for he was intrusted with designs of most costly country houses. In 1760 he designed Harewood House in Yorkshire, and in 1762 Tabley in Cheshire, with a frontage of 343 ft. Between 1751-1764 he was building Lytham Hall in Lancashire, and in 1770 he designed the east front of Wentworth House, including the great gallery, 180 ft. long by 24 ft. wide and 30 ft. high.[1] In 1776 he designed Basildon Park in Berkshire with a frontage of 275 ft., the Town Hall of Newark, and the County Court House at York, and in 1778 Dunton Park. Carr also designed Thoresby Lodge, the Crescent at Buxton, and many large private houses. He was twice Mayor of York, and died in 1807 at the age of eighty-four. The most important of Carr's designs is Harewood House, decorated by Adam.[2] The plan of this is a parallelogram of about 247 ft. by 84 ft., the ground storey is occupied by kitchen and offices, coffee room and billiard room. The reception rooms are on the first floor and include a central hall 31 ft. by 41 ft., two dining-rooms, a gallery 77 ft. by 24 ft. 6 in., a music room, salon, drawing-room, and library, and various bed and dressing rooms. The façade is divided up into a central block carried up three storeys, and separated by lower buildings from two slightly projecting wings. On the north side the centre block has an engaged hexastyle Corinthian order with columns 3 ft. in diameter, and a flight of stairs the full width of the order. The

[1] See above, p. 245. It is probable that Carr availed himself of the original design prepared by Flitcroft thirty years before, with considerable modifications.

[2] It appears that Carr's design was selected in a competition. Chambers ("Civil Architecture") says that his design for Lord Charlemont's casino at Marino was originally made for "one of the end pavilions of a considerable composition . . . which among many others his Lordship (Lord Harewood) procured for Harewood House." See p. 264 below.

ground storey is rusticated, and the wings have coupled pilasters on either side of large Venetian windows under a single arch. This treatment is varied on the south side. The proportions are correct, but there is nothing original about the design, and the most that can be said for it is that it is free from affectation and not particularly ugly.[1] Carr was by no means a brilliant designer, but he appears to have been a good practical architect, who was kept within reasonable limits of taste by a sound tradition and an abundance of excellent pattern books.

The old tradition, however, was fast disappearing. The architects of the second half of the eighteenth century were convinced that theirs was one of the greatest eras of architecture that the world had ever seen. In the fullness of their pride they were no longer content with the old ways but fell in with the prevailing dilettantism of the time, and met the rage for novelty with garbled and inaccurate versions of Greek architecture on the one hand and of Gothic on the other. The first volume of Stuart and Revett's "Athenian Antiquities" appeared in 1762. Gandon says, "on the appearance of Stuart's Athens there was a great sensation among the admirers of the fine arts, it grew into an almost mania for Greek architecture" (Mulvany's "Life of Gandon," p. 197). Stuart at once became a fashionable architect and a sort of *arbiter elegantiarum* in matters of taste. Lord Anson got him appointed surveyor of Greenwich Hospital, in which capacity he rebuilt the interior of the chapel and left it a standing monument of all the faults of the style which he introduced. One distinguished architect alone resisted the fashion, and he, curiously enough, began his career in another calling, and became an architect in the face of his personal interests from pure enthusiasm for the art. Sir William Chambers was the son of a Yorkshire merchant settled at Stockholm. He was educated in Yorkshire, and was intended to follow his father's business, and with this object went out to the East Indies and to China as a supercargo, when he seems to have employed his time in making drawings of the buildings and gardens of the Chinese, and collecting the materials which he afterwards published in his "Dissertation on Oriental Gardening." On his return from the East, at the age of eighteen, Chambers definitely abandoned trade and went to France, where he worked for a time in Paris under Clerisseau, and thence to Italy, where he resided some years, studying architecture and making some slight reputation by his drawings among the *virtuosi*. Chambers's industry was unwearied,

[1] Harewood was altered by Barry, and the original design has suffered severely from Barry's alterations.

Frith & Co., Photo.

HAREWOOD HOUSE, YORKSHIRE. Earl of York.

Face p. 262.

and he returned to England full of knowledge and an accomplished draughtsman, but an unknown man. His chance came to him through Carr of York. Lord Bute was anxious to find an artist to instruct the Prince of Wales (afterwards George III.), and asked Carr to name a suitable person.[1] The latter recommended Chambers and Lord Bute introduced him to the prince, "who became in course of time so much attached to him, that, when he came to the Crown, he appointed him his chief architect, and promoted him whenever any opportunity offered."[2] Chambers's earliest work was at Kew Gardens, where he designed a number of foolish pagodas by no means creditable to his taste, but probably dictated by his patron, and also some temples and an orange house of excellent proportions and simplicity. Views of these buildings were published in 1763, but Chambers had already established his reputation by his treatise on "The Decorative Part of Civil Architecture," published in 1759, and on the accession of George III. he was appointed private architect to the king. In 1769 he succeeded Flitcroft as comptroller in the office of works. In 1768 he was made treasurer to the Royal Academy, and knighted in 1771 on the occasion of his receiving the Order of the Polar Star from the King of Sweden. In 1782 he succeeded Whitshed Keene as surveyor-general of the office of works. He died in 1796 and was buried in Westminster Abbey. Throughout his career Chambers was an exceedingly successful architect. It appears from the plates published at the end of his treatise on civil architecture in 1759, that he must have obtained employment almost immediately on his return from Italy, chiefly as a designer of triumphal archways and casinos. The entrance archway at Wilton is a good example. The casinos were ornamental buildings usually copied from some smaller Roman temple.[3] They were placed in the grounds at some distance from the house, and intended in the smaller examples merely as an elaborate and costly summer-house, but in more important instances they contained sufficient accommodation for the owner and two or three servants. The first academical exercise of every young architect in the latter part of the eighteenth century was the design of a casino, and no great nobleman's grounds were considered complete without one. Chambers designed many of these buildings, as, for instance, for Lady Pembroke at Wilton, for Lord Bruce at Tanfield

[1] This introduction is also attributed to Joshua Kirby and John Gynn.

[2] Gwilt's "Memoir."

[3] One of Chambers's earliest works in England was a temple at Coleby Hall in Notts, said to have been modelled on the Temple of Romulus and Remus at Rome.

Hall in Yorkshire, casinos for Mr. Willoughby, Lord Tilney, and others, and more especially a most sumptuous casino at Marino near Dublin for Lord Charlemont, said to have cost £60,000. This building consists of a basement including kitchen, scullery, cellars, servants' hall, and offices. Above this is a principal storey planned as a Greek cross, on a platform 49 ft. by 49 ft., surrounded by a peristyle of twelve Doric columns with a complete entablature and balustrade. This floor contains a vestibule with stairs to the left, a bedroom, saloon, and study; the flues are brought together in the roof and the smoke issues through an urn at the top. The fittings were most costly, and it is throughout an extreme example of an absurd and extravagant fashion.

While engaged at Marino Chambers was also superintending various alterations at Trinity College, Dublin, including the new theatre and chapel. His next important works were Dudingstone near Edinburgh, begun in 1767, the observatory in Richmond Park in 1768, Castle Hill, Dorset, the entrance gateway and other additions at Blenheim, houses for Lord Melbourne in Piccadilly, 1770 (now the centre block of the Albany), and for Lord Gower in Whitehall, and other works of more or less importance, which occupied his attention until he was employed on the great work of his life, Somerset House. Part of the old Royal Palace was pulled down in 1775[1] and the new buildings started in 1776. They were practically finished at the date of Chambers's death, though his complete scheme was never carried out in its entirety. Chambers's task was one of great difficulty. He had only a narrow frontage to the Strand in advance of his main area, though on the south side he had a magnificent frontage to the river. Moreover, Chambers had to provide sets of offices for various government departments and other purposes on a scale hitherto never attempted in England. These problems he solved with consummate success. The plan consists of an advanced block on the north side, with a frontage of 135 ft., containing the main entrance from the Strand; this block forms on the south side (that is, the side to the court) a recessed centre piece to the north end of the court. The court measures 240 ft. wide by 296 ft. deep,[2] surrounded by buildings 54 ft. deep containing various government offices. The south, or river front, was intended to have a total length of 800 ft. Chambers's idea was to increase the width of his façade by building on the east and west sides of his main quadrangle detached

[1] It appears from Chambers's report to the House of Commons in 1780, that part of the old palace was still standing.

[2] These dimensions are taken from Chambers's report. They do not agree with the dimensions figured in the plans in Britton and Pugin, "Public Buildings of London."

Principal Floor



Cellar Story



Plans of the Lord Viscount Charlemont's Casine at Marino.

FROM CHAMBERS'S "CIVIL ARCHITECTURE," PLATE 37.

rows of private houses running north and south, uniform in style with Somerset House, and connected with it on the south side by great archways opening on the terrace. Above these archways are colonnades supporting entablatures and pediments. The idea was an extremely fine one: by means of it Chambers was able to make a complete composition of the river front, with a central frontispiece balanced at either end by the bold design of the archway. There is possibly a certain confusion and weakness in putting a single archway under a heavy colonnade, but the light and shade of the design is extremely effective, and it is one of the few pieces of architecture in London that suggest the mighty loggias of Italy. Only the western part of this scheme was completed. Though the eastern arch was built, the buildings beyond it were left unfinished; and the river façade terminates at the south-east angle in a lame and discreditable corner.

I have pointed out above that the site, as handed over to Chambers, ran right down to the river. Chambers met this difficulty by building along the south side a platform of masonry above the level of the river, and on this he built a basement storey for warehouses and offices, fronted by a massive arcade of rustic masonry, supporting the great south terrace, 46 ft. wide. In the centre was a wide archway or water-gate, communicating with the basement storey; and at either end, opposite the open colonnades to the east and west of the quadrangle two gateways flanked by rusticated columns supporting lions. The appearance of the river front has been very much altered since the formation of the Thames Embankment. Before this was made, and before Waterloo Bridge was built, the building rose sheer out of the river at high water, and the tide ran in through the central archway under the terrace; at high water, at any rate, the effect must have been extremely fine, even finer than it is now; and this fact ought to be recollected in appreciating the design of the arcade below the terrace. Somerset House is faced throughout with Portland stone, and is one of the best built buildings in London. Chambers took immense pains with his detail. He had models made for his Ionic, Composite, and Corinthian capitals from the choicest antiques in Rome; he was most careful in his selection of workmen, and most precise in his instructions. He evidently had an honest horror of careless and ignorant workmanship, whether on the part of the architect or of the builder. In his treatise he says, "The most masterly disposition incorrectly executed can only be considered as a sketch in painting, or as an excellent piece of music miserably murdered by village fiddlers." All that pains and

From Belcher & Macartney's "Later Renaissance," etc.

Face p. 266.

SOMERSET HOUSE.

intelligence could do, Chambers did at Somerset House; he had the best materials, the most skilful workmen and sculptors, his own exact knowledge and academical fastidiousness of taste. Yet pains and intelligence will not of themselves turn out a masterpiece. With all its merits—and the river front is one of the few really great public buildings in London—Somerset House is open to a good deal of criticism in detail. The Strand front is altogether inferior to Inigo Jones's magnificent fragment in Whitehall. The banqueting-house is 120 ft. wide out to out by 78 ft. to the top of the balustrade. Its façade consists of a rusticated basement, supporting a complete Ionic order, in seven bays, with a Corinthian order over, and a balustrade. The pilasters are coupled at the angles, and the centre bays slightly advanced beyond the rest. The Strand front of Somerset House measures 132 ft. 11 in. in width by 62 ft. to the top of the balustrade, and 70 ft. to the top of the blocking course of the attic storey over the three centre bays. The façade consists of a rusticated arcade on the ground floor in nine bays, with a Corinthian order over (comprising two storeys of windows) and a balustrade and an attic over the three centre bays. Chambers seems to have exactly inverted Inigo Jones's design. Instead of the continuous basement of the banqueting-house, he has started his arcade from the ground level. Instead of following the usual progression of orders, he has jumped at once from a rusticated ground storey to the Corinthian order; and where Inigo Jones, by making the three centre bays different from the two bays on either side, established a rhythm and proportion throughout the whole, Chambers has divided his nine bays into three equal parts, with the result that his façade is flat and uninteresting, and misses the beautiful proportions of Inigo Jones's design.

Chambers's work is always a little forced and over-conscious; the consequence is that it is unequal, and sometimes fails in that organic relationship which binds together every detail of the work of architects of strong natural genius. For instance, the main entrance from the Strand passes under vaulting, carried by two rows of coupled Doric columns. In itself this is a very accomplished piece of classical detail, but it has no relation whatever to the rusticated ground storey of the Strand front, and Chambers has not even attempted to get over the difficulty of combining the two. It seems evident that Chambers thought out his designs piecemeal, that he worked not from the whole down to the details, but upwards, from the details to the whole—one of the worst faults of modern architecture. One has, of course, to discount the conditions of the time. Chambers lived at a period when, on the

one hand, academical tradition was inexorable in its rigorous dogmatism, and, on the other hand, the taste for all sorts of mannerisms and affectations in architecture was rapidly spreading. Both these tendencies were against the development of original genius, yet, looking fairly at the facts, and fully recognizing that Chambers stood far above his contemporaries in architectural attainment, one is forced to conclude that architecture in England had indeed degenerated since the end of the seventeenth century. Chambers was a clear-headed and most capable architect, with complete knowledge of his art; his masculine intelligence kept him clear of the frippery of the Adams, and he believed himself in earnest in following the great traditions of classical design. But somehow there is little vitality in his work. The vigour and energy of design possessed by the earlier men, their power of convincing the mind that their architecture was human and individual, and the expression of the designer's own personality,—these and other qualities had gone out with the seventeenth century, and in studying the work of the last half of the eighteenth century one is habitually reminded of the unwelcome truth that first-rate intellectual capacity is not the same thing as genius in design. Chambers had one supreme merit, however. He was a man of strong principle and scrupulous artistic conscience. He declined to give way to the prevailing dilettantism, and adhered staunchly to the classical traditions as taught by the great Italian architects.

Chambers had various pupils, of whom the ablest was James Gandon, architect of the Custom House at Dublin, the Four Courts, and other important works. Gandon was born in 1742. His first work was the County Hall and Prison, Nottingham, won in competition, and built 1769-70. He won the gold medal for architecture at the Academy in 1768, and the second prize for a competition for the Royal Exchange in Dublin in 1769, and the first prize for the new Bethlehem Asylum in 1776, but in both cases his private interest was not sufficient to secure him the work. He had, however, powerful friends, and through Lord Carlow he was employed to design the new Custom House and Docks at Dublin in 1781. The difficulties of site somewhat resembled those with which Chambers had to deal at Somerset House: a good part of the site was under water at high tide, water was found 2 ft. below the surface, and when Gandon began pile-driving for his footings, water showed round the trial pile, and he had to substitute planking.[1] Besides these natural obstacles, he had to

[1] The foundations under the piers of the cupola presented this difficulty. A pile 10 ft. long and 1 ft. square was driven in 9 ft. When the ram would drive it no farther, and

Frith & Co., Photo.

THE CUSTOM HOUSE, DUBLIN.

Face p. 268.

contend with a very obstinate corporation, who began by pulling down one of his walls. Gandon, however, was finally successful, and the buildings were completed in 1791. The design is a very fine one, quite as able in its way as his master's design for Somerset House.

His other principal works were the Four Courts at Dublin, completed at a cost of about £60,000, the portico of Parliament House, with additions to the House of Lords, and the King's Rooms, Dublin, 1806-1808. In the latter year Gandon resigned the control of the works in an extremely dignified reply to some offensive remarks by Lord Chancellor Redesdale, and retired to his private estate at Lucan, where he occupied himself with planting, and died 1823. Gandon followed Chambers in his preference for Roman architecture, and in his general conception of design. His interest in architecture lay rather in its mechanical than in its artistic side, but he was a bold constructor and a man of powerful imagination. The Custom House of Dublin, with the splendid outline of its dome, ranks high in the record of the eighteenth century. With Newgate Prison and Somerset House it represents the final effort of the eighteenth century tradition, and the three are probably the finest public buildings erected in Great Britain since the time of Wren.

Both in virtue of his parentage, and of his own manner in architecture, perhaps Dance the younger may fairly be taken as the last of the old school. He was the son of the old City Surveyor, and born in 1741. He had the advantage of his father in receiving an adequate training, for he went early in his life to Italy, and spent several years in that country in the study of architecture. In 1763 he won the gold medal of the Academy of Parma for a design for a public gallery, and in 1764 he was elected a member of the Academy of St. Luke's, at Rome. He appears to have returned to London either this year or in 1765, the date of his design for the Church of All Hallows, London Wall. He succeeded his father in the post of City Surveyor in 1768,

water showed round the pile, Gandon, remembering a remark of Labelye's, was afraid of opening up fresh springs; he accordingly abandoned piling, and had prepared "a grating of Memel timber one foot square, the upper ones notched down three inches on the ground pieces, which were to be bedded on a layer of cut heath correctly levelled, the interstices of the grating to be filled up with hard stock bricks up to level of timbers, swimming in mortar composed of pounded roach lime and mortar well mixed; above this, 4-inch fir planks fastened to the grating, with oak trennels; above this, rough blocks of mountain granite in regular courses." In the first course was sunk an iron chain of flat bar 4 in. by 2½ in. in collars run with lead, the bars were coated with "a cement of wax, resin, and stone dust." It took a year and four months to complete the foundations.

and in the same year was elected one of the original forty academicians, and professor of architecture to the Academy. Dance died in 1825. Of his house designs, the most important examples are Wilderness Park and the Grange at Alresford in Kent, Stratton Park and Coleorton, in Leicestershire, and various additions to Bowood. Dance also designed Finsbury Square (1777-1791), and Alfred Place and Crescent, Bloomsbury (1790-1814), a not very successful attempt in street design; the College of Surgeons, in Lincoln's Inn Fields,[1] and various other works; but his two most important works, one of which at least has assured him a permanent reputation, are St. Luke's Hospital in Old Street, and Newgate Prison. Fergusson, who wrote with a superficial knowledge of English architecture, has blundered badly in regard to Newgate. After pointing out that Dance, the City architect, produced in the Mansion House "an effective and gorgeous design," especially before it lost what he calls "the two crowning masses" of the attic storey,[2] he goes on to say that his *chef d'œuvre* was Newgate Prison, and that "from what we know of Dance's character, we are led to suspect that it may have been mere ignorance that led him to do right on this occasion." Fergusson evidently knew nothing at all of Dance's character, for Newgate was designed by his son (George Dance the younger, an architect who had received an exceptionally thorough training in his art), and was not begun until 1770, two years after the death of the elder Dance, and was not finally completed till 1782. The general plan consists of a block of buildings in the centre with a quadrangle at the back, and two smaller quadrangles on either side. At the time when Dance made his design, prison administration was very little studied, and the arrangements seem grim and inhuman in the last degree; this, however, was rather the fault of the time than of the architect, and in the north and particularly the front elevations, Dance succeeded in producing an extraordinarily impressive building. It consists of an immense rusticated wall of stone, 297 ft. long, and about 50 ft. high, with a broad projecting bay in the centre, carried one storey above the blocking course, and two smaller bays on either side, with niches above the ground storey. These bays or projections are very slightly advanced in front of the line of the façade. The prison entrances are to the right and left of the central bay. The fault of the design is the unpleasant crowding of the windows in the centre bay,

[1] Since rebuilt by Barry.

[2] The south attic was removed by young Dance in 1795-6, and the north was taken down in 1842. See above, chapter x., p. 251.



ENTRANCE TO NEWGATE PRISON. Dance the young

necessitated, no doubt, by the fact that this was the keeper's house, but closer thought might perhaps have hit on some treatment more in scale with the rest, and might at any rate have avoided the unpleasant conflict between the arched window-heads and the massive squareness of the rest of the building. This is the one fault of the design. The two entrances on either side are admirable in their extreme austerity and perfect maintenance of the scale of the façade. It is seldom, indeed, that an architect gets a chance of a huge bare wall to deal with, but no architect ever made a better use of his opportunity than did Dance at Newgate. How far it may have been suggested by some of the tremendous conceptions of Piranesi's Carcere d'Invenzione, it is difficult to say, but that Dance knew thoroughly what he was about there can be no question. In the hospital of St. Luke's, Old Street, he gave further evidence of his power to grasp the imaginative conditions of an architectural problem. This building, though in a less degree than Newgate, shows Dance's capacity for severe selection and restraint in his design, and one the more regrets that in his later works Dance lost touch of this excellent simple manner, and in the Church of St. Bartholomew the Less, wandered off into the ridiculous Gothic of the period.[1]

For some time, however, the tendency to eclecticism, with its accompanying anarchy of taste, had been steadily at work; and perhaps the chief offenders were "the four enterprising brothers named Adam," as Britton and Pugin somewhat contemptuously style them. The Adams were a family of architects. William Adam, the father, was an architect of considerable reputation in Scotland between the years 1730 and 1760, and all his four sons were brought up to the same calling. Robert and James, however, were the most famous, and they were throughout associated in their work, the only independent designs attributed to James Adam being the Adelphi buildings and certain houses in Portland Place; but these so exactly resemble the work of his more celebrated brother, that it is impossible to assign to them any distinct manner in design, and for the purpose of the history of architecture, Robert Adam may be taken as representing the brothers.

Robert Adam was born in 1728, and educated at Edinburgh University. He began his travels in 1754, when he visited Nismes;

[1] Dance not only executed his columns and other details in deal, which showed signs of dry rot within thirty years, but wherever any of the original Gothic detail came in his way, he simply hacked it off. See Godwin's "Churches of London," vol. ii. St. Bartholomew the Less.



LUTON HOUSE, PLAN.

(R. & J. Adam's "Works in Architecture," I., pl. 2)

[to face p. 272



PLAN OF HOUSE IN GROSVENOR SQUARE.

(R. & J. Adam's "Works in Architecture," II., pl. 1)

[to face p. 272

he was at Rome in 1756, and at Venice in the summer of 1757, when with Clerisseau and two other draughtsmen, he spent five weeks in measuring up the ruins of Diocletian's palace at Spalatro. The drawings of this palace were published in 1764. Adam returned to England in 1758, and at once began practice. The screen and gateway of the Admiralty, one of the earliest of his designs, and on the whole the best, was built in 1760, and Shardeloe in Buckinghamshire, 1759-61, was his first important house, followed up by an extensive re-modelling of Sion House in 1761-62 and Kedlestone, 1761-65, a design often spoken of as characteristic of Adam's manner, though in point of fact the credit of the plan belongs to Paine. Shelburne House (now Lansdowne House) was begun in 1765, Kenwood,[1] between Highgate and Hampstead, in 1764-7, Luton House in 1767, and the Ranger's Lodge in the Green Park (since destroyed) in 1768. From 1768 onwards the brothers were busily employed in London. The Adelphi buildings, including the house of the Society of Arts, which were carried out from their designs, appear to have been a family speculation, and it seems that the Adams enjoy the doubtful honour of being the earliest of modern English architects to embark on the thorny paths of finance and speculative building. Mansfield Street, Portland Place (1770), a house at the corner of Harewood Place, Stratford Place, and a great quantity of houses between Park Lane and Hanover Square, seem to have been built in this way by the Adam family, and decorated with their—or rather with Liardet's—patent stucco, a material in which the Adams had a pecuniary interest.[2] Meanwhile, Robert Adam carried on his private practice indefatigably. In 1771 he designed the Record Office at Edinburgh, in 1773 he designed a house for Sir Watkyn Wynne in St. James's Square, and one for Lord Derby in Grosvenor Square, in 1776 Drury Lane Theatre, and the infirmary at Glasgow at about the same time. The new buildings for Edinburgh University were begun from his designs in 1778, but only part of Adam's designs was carried out. In 1776 he designed an extraordinary church at Mistley in Essex, White's Club in St. James's Square, and various private houses, including Witham in Somersetshire, and Compton in Warwickshire, and additions, alterations, and decorations for houses without number.

[1] Adam says that from Kenwood the ships could be seen passing up and down the Thames, and to the north-east and west of the house, the "mountainous villages of Highgate and Hampstead form delightful objects."

[2] The worthlessness of this stucco may be gathered from certain dilapidated remnants of decoration still visible in the houses on the east side of Fitzroy Square.

Gossford House in East Lothian was one of the brothers' latest works, and the east and south sides of Fitzroy Square (1790), their latest venture in speculative building. Robert Adam died in 1792 and was buried in Westminster Abbey, and his brother James died two years later.

It is evident from certain remarks in his published works,[1] that Robert Adam regarded himself as an original thinker in architecture on two grounds: first, that he had introduced a fresh method of house planning, and, secondly, that he had greatly purified ornamental detail and enlarged its scope. In his preface he takes credit to himself for having "brought about a kind of revolution in this useful and elegant art," for Adam had no false modesty about his work. In regard to house planning, he considered that he had advanced on Inigo Jones and others "in the disposition and relief of his apartments," by which he seems to mean that whereas they were content with comparatively simple forms such as squares, oblongs, or circles, he introduced an abundance of ovals and ellipses, and constantly varied the shape of his rooms in order to avoid monotony. As a matter of fact, if he had turned over the pages of the "Vitruvius Britannicus," he would have found that he had been anticipated in every one of his inventions, but Adam undoubtedly had a remarkable power of designing great vistas of rooms *en suite*, and though he spoilt them by the feebleness of his decorations, some of his plans are very able. Sion House is a good example. The original plan which Adam was called in to re-model was quadrangular. Adam filled this up with a great central hall, 50 ft. in diameter, surrounded by a peristyle, giving a total diameter of 70 ft. and he brought this court into communication with the sides by vestibules in the centre of the four sides. He repeated this plan in a new building in the Record Office at Edinburgh, where the diameter of the central hall is also 50 ft. So again at Luton House, built for Lord Bute in 1767, and one of the best examples of Adam's domestic work, he adopted a general H-shaped plan, the centre occupied by a circular hall 40 ft. in diameter opening into a saloon 64 ft. by 24 ft., the left-hand wing occupied by the dining-room, ante-room, and with drawing-room *en suite*, the right-hand wing by the library, cut up into three divisions by colonnades, but capable of being thrown open, so that a vista could be obtained from end to end of a total length of 142 ft. At Lansdowne House, in much the same way, he formed the gallery of three rooms *en suite*, an oblong room in the centre,

[1] "The Works of Robert and James Adam, Esq.," London, 1778.



LUTON HOUSE.

(R. & J. Adam's "Works in Architecture," I., 3)

[to face p. 274

38 ft. by 30 ft., with circular rooms at each end, 30 ft. in diameter, giving a total length of 103 ft. In Lord Derby's house, and Sir Watkyn Wynne's, both built on long narrow sites and very well planned, Adam again devoted himself to providing sets of rooms *en suite*, but the houses, whether for effect or convenience, are in no way superior to many an example of a London house, planned fifty or a hundred years before. In regard to detail, Adam's pretensions have even less foundation. He understood selection in ornament; that is to say, he knew where to place his ornament, and at his best, where to stay his hand; but in so far as he introduced any innovation in detail, it was wholly for the bad, and probably little value would be placed on the furniture and other articles carried out from his designs, except for their admirable workmanship, for skill in execution long outlasted the capacity for design in English architecture and its handicrafts. Adam considered that he had refined the details of Roman architecture by reference to Greek models, but as he depended for his accuracy on Stuart and Revett, the result was neither one thing nor the other, and inferior to either. He notes certain modifications which he introduced into the volute, and that he diminished his columns from the base upwards, instead of from one-third of the way up, and he also invented what he calls a Britannic order with lions and unicorns for volutes. But what he particularly prided himself on was his stucco ornamentation, on pink, green, and light-blue ground; and his "Etruscan manner" coloured red, yellow, brown or black, on a white ground, which was really based on second-rate Roman wall decoration. Such work was merely fashionable, and speedily gave way to fresh fashions and revivalisms, in their turn to disappear before the modern Gothic revival. Adam was the immediate precursor of Wilkins and Soane, and can hardly be looked upon as belonging to the traditional line of English architects. His earlier work, such as the Admiralty Screen,[1] touches it, but his later designs, such as Fitzroy Square, are as remote from the manner of Inigo Jones or Christopher Wren, as the work of the eminent Nash himself.

[1] This screen has been greatly admired, and as a design in itself and apart from its surroundings it is a beautiful composition. As a screen to the Admiralty, however, it is absurd, and there is some justice in Britton and Pugin's criticism, that it is "in a very flimsy petty taste," and that though it might look well on paper, it was actually ridiculous "when executed on a scale not much exceeding in height that of a respectable shop-front." Adam was always too much of a draughtsman and decorator and too little of an architect,

CHAPTER XII.

House Planning in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.

In a previous chapter[1] I endeavoured to show how the civilized house of the latter part of the sixteenth century grew out of the two types of the mediæval house; first, from the fortified house with inner courts, and in the second place from the smaller mediæval house with a hall in the centre and rooms at either end; and how, by slow degrees, the hall, from being the common living room of the household, developed into a main entrance hall for access to the great staircase and for communication between the different rooms. As the necessary accompaniment of this change, the old solar developed into the withdrawing room; a separate dining chamber was provided, and the great gallery, characteristic of the seventeenth century, became the principal feature of the house. The gallery was usually on the first or second floor, and hence arose the greatly increased importance of the principal staircase. In larger houses, such as Cobham, Audley End, or Knole, the principal rooms are on the first floor, but the ground floor was not yet treated as simply a basement storey given up to offices and cellars. The Jacobean house, though by no means perfect in plan, was fairly reasonable in its arrangements and eminently habitable. Its chief defect was that the building was very thin, that is, it seldom comprised more than a single set of rooms and a corridor which had to be ranged round the sides of a court, and the consequence was that the long draughty passages made the house cold, and that the kitchen and offices were placed at an inconvenient distance from the living rooms of the house.

With the introduction of Palladianism, early in the seventeenth century, all this was changed. Inigo Jones came back from Italy with his mind saturated with the designs of Palladio, and he set to work to introduce his ideas with an energy and genius that practically revolutionized house planning in England. The quadrangular plan was

[1] Chapter IV.



SECTION OF THE LIBRARY AT KENWOOD.

(R. & J. Adam's "Works in Architecture," I., 5)

[to face p. 276



A PLAN SHOWING PROPOSED ADDITIONS AND ALTERATIONS (LATE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY) TO A SIXTEENTH CENTURY HOUSE.
(ALL SOULS' COLLECTION.)

generally abandoned.[1] The ground floor was treated specifically as a basement: Inigo Jones expressly notes in his Palladio that "cellars and other magazines should never be put under ground." The first floor became the piano nobile which controlled the whole plan, and usually necessitated the sacrifice of other parts of the house. The only survival of the Jacobean plan was the great gallery which, in a modified form, lasted well into the eighteenth century. This first or principal floor was usually reached by a grand flight of steps outside the house, which gave access to the main entrance hall and thence to the principal rooms ranged on either side of the hall and beyond it. Rainham in Norfolk is an instance. The immediate result of this change was the practical abandonment of the great staircase. As soon as the principal rooms of the house were collected on the first floor, and access to this first floor was provided from without, the *raison d'être* of the grand staircase as the approach to the chief reception rooms was gone. Accordingly the staircase was usually confined to the subordinate function of communicating with bedrooms and attics only, and there was consequently little inducement to spend money on its decoration. This was less the case in the seventeenth century than in the eighteenth. The tradition of the sixteenth century was too deeply engrained in the architecture of the country to be abandoned at once, and throughout the seventeenth century beautiful staircases, such as that of Ashburnham House and Coleshill, continued to be built, in which, though Palladian details were used, some of the feeling of the fine spectacular staircase of the Elizabethan house still lingers. Inigo Jones had too fine an artistic instinct to abandon readily such an admirable means of effect. But there was usually some specific reason as well, such, for instance, as a contracted site, to account for these grand staircases in later work. The eighteenth century architects lost all touch with this tradition, and one finds in their plans a growing tendency to sacrifice everything to the hall, the salon, and the reception rooms, and to treat the staircase, or rather staircases—for the exigencies of their design compelled them to introduce several—as merely necessities of communication; the chief exception to this being in the case of town houses, where the limitations of the site prevented a grand external flight of steps, and the entrance had to be made in the ground floor with access to the reception rooms on the first floor by a principal staircase.

Partly on account of the wider range of his genius, and partly owing

[1] Three-sided courts, however, continued to be built down to the end of the seventeenth century, as at Belton, and Appuldurcombe in the Isle of Wight, built in 1710.



STAIRCASE, ASHBURNHAM HOUSE.

to the conditions of contemporary architecture, there are more variations to be found in the plans of Inigo Jones than in those of his successors. In the plan of Lindsey House[1] (1640) there is a grand staircase at the back of the entrance hall, with a servants' staircase at the side from the basement to the first and principal floor, and the hall is the height of one floor only. On the other hand, at the Queen's House at Greenwich, designed about the same time,[2] Inigo Jones provided a salon, a cube of 40 ft., occupying the height of both storeys, with a large circular staircase entered from one corner of the salon, and two other staircases. In both houses Jones provided small courts to light the inner rooms, a somewhat objectionable device, but one more reasonable in every way than the method of the eighteenth century architects who were content to light their mezzanines and passages with borrowed lights from the hall or the leads, or who dispensed with light and air altogether if the windows interfered with the symmetry of their design. Here again the virtue of the older English tradition of planning is evident, for these small courts are the survival of the English sixteenth century plan, which made light and air points of primary importance, as the result of long experience of the necessities of an uncertain climate. The eighteenth century architects were in constant difficulties about light and air for the bedrooms and servants' quarters, because they insisted on following literally the designs made by an Italian architect for an Italian climate.

At Chevening[3] in Kent, which was probably designed by Inigo Jones, the main staircase was in the entrance hall, and beyond this the principal salon. This house was typical of an arrangement which became common towards the end of the seventeenth century; the plan was an oblong of about 88 ft. by 65 ft.; of this the hall and salon together occupy rather more than a third of the total plan, the hall and salon measuring 31 ft. in width, the suites of apartments on either side each measuring 21 ft. in width. Coleshill in Berkshire is another example. The plan here is an oblong, with hall and salon in the centre, as at Chevening. The staircase is in the main entrance hall, 40 ft. by 31 ft., at the back of this is the salon, 41 ft. by 22 ft., and the two take up almost exactly the centre third of the total ground area. The great dining-room is on the first floor, immediately above the salon, and accordingly the architect reverted to the older habit of making a grand staircase in

[1] "Vitruvius Britannicus," i. 49.
[2] *Ibid.*, i. 14, 15.
[3] Since rebuilt.


50 Feet
Extends 98
The Elevation of Chevening house in Kent the Seat of the Rt Hon.ble the late Earl of Sussex is most humbly Inscribd to the Rt Hon.ble the Countess Dowager of Sussex.
Elevation de la Maison de Chevening dans la Comté de Kent.
22 Sqr
21 Sqr
50 Feet
Extends 98
Plan of the First Floor.
Plan du Premier Etage.
Plan of the Second Floor.
Plan du Second Etage.

CHEVENING, KENT.

(Vitruv. Brit. II., 85)



PLAN OF LINDSEY HOUSE. (FROM "VITRUVIUS BRITANNICUS," i. 49.)

order to bring the dining-room into connection with the reception rooms of the house. Two separate flights start on either side of the main entrance, reaching a landing in front of the dining-room on the upper floor. The basement storey, with windows above the ground level, is



A PLAN AMONGST WREN'S DRAWINGS. (ALL SOULS' COLLECTION.)

entirely occupied by the kitchen and offices, storerooms and cellars. The comparative simplicity of this plan makes it one of the best examples of seventeenth century planning.

At Amesbury in Wiltshire (since rebuilt) the main staircase was at the back of the hall, and the two together occupy about a third of the



FIRST FLOOR PLAN



PLANS OF ELTHAM CLUB HOUSE.

total plan. In the Amesbury staircase the well is occupied by a circular newel staircase inside the main stairs,[1] in the space which in large modern houses is sometimes occupied by a lift. In the fine house at Eltham (now occupied by the Golf Club), which probably dates from about 1660, fully one-third of the house longitudinally is taken up by the principal staircase and a serving stair beyond. In Kent's "Inigo Jones," vol. ii., p. 49, a plan is given of a house which consists of a central block advanced beyond the side wings containing the offices. The central block has an open portico leading into a great hall of eight columns, 46 ft. by 29 ft., with two grand staircases at the side, 29 ft. by 19 ft. Beyond the hall and the two staircases are three rooms arranged *en suite;* the plan is certainly a fine one. Kent gives no name to the house, and the wings more resemble Kent's design than Inigo Jones's.

The plan of Belvoir[2] is chiefly remarkable for its suggestion of the old Jacobean plan. The general plan was a very flat H, with entrance halls in the centre of the end wings and a large hall in the centre, 60 ft. by 30 ft.; in the first floor is shown a gallery, 160 ft. long by 29 ft. wide. Belvoir, however, does not represent the typical plan adopted by Inigo Jones, who practically founded modern house planning. His favourite plan was either a square, as at Greenwich or Gunnersbury, or an oblong, as at Coleshill and Chevening. Roughly speaking, he divided this into three parts, devoting the central third, or thereabouts, to the hall and staircase. This was a great advance on the courtyard plan of the Jacobean designers in compactness and convenience, and, with the exception of modern revivalist work, has been more or less adhered to ever since. As part of his system of proportion, Inigo Jones greatly increased the height of his rooms, introducing the double cube, as in the great room at Wilton, or the single cube, as at Greenwich; but, generally speaking, he was content with 16 ft. to 18 ft. for the principal floor, and

[1] Inigo Jones had a particular fondness for a staircase inside another, so that people might pass up and down unobserved. Another variation is shown in Plate XLVIII., vol. ii. of Kent's "Inigo Jones," this latter instance being based on the stairs at Chambord and a design of Palladio's. In note to Plate XLII. of his Palladio, now in Worcester College Library, Inigo Jones says, "I have seen the stairs at Chambord in France, and there are but two ways to ascend, and round the newel is a wall with windows in it to give light to those stairs. I am sure Palladio had heard talk of this staircase, and from thence he has invented these which are much more magnificent." In the designs for the Duke of Queensberry's house (Kent, ii. 8, 9), the stairs are shown at the back of the hall, with a newel staircase for servants in the well of the staircase.

[2] Kent, "Inigo Jones," ii. 22, 23. Belvoir has been entirely rebuilt.

from 14 ft. to 16 ft. for the bedrooms. The exaggerated heights of later work were due to the eighteenth century architects. In the "Designs of Inigo Jones," published by Kent, a number of eccentric designs are given which are of doubtful authenticity; such, for instance, as the plans based on a Greek cross,[1] and the various circular and octagonal plans.[2] No name is given to these designs, and it is very doubtful whether, if made by Inigo Jones, they were ever intended by him as anything more than exercises in the Palladian manner, being in many cases based on designs given in Palladio's work. It is probable that Kent found them in Lord Burlington's collection of drawings, and allowed himself considerable license in their reproduction. In any case, they have no more relation to the development of English house planning than such caprices as Campbell's villa at Mereworth.

Not only did Inigo Jones thus introduce the block plan as opposed to the courtyard plan, but it seems probable that he was the first architect in England to adopt the plan of a central block with advanced wings which became such a prominent feature in the larger designs of Vanbrugh and his successors. The earliest instance of this that I can find is Stoke Park in Northamptonshire,[3] which, according to Campbell, was begun by Inigo Jones in 1640, and carried out as far as the wings, colonnades, and the foundations of the house, when the work was stopped by the Civil War, and the house was completed after the Restoration. The main block stands in the centre, and from the two front angles start colonnades, laid out as a quadrant, communicating with the library to the left, and the chapel to the right. A raised terrace or platform occupies the space between the front of the house, the chapel, and the library, with a flight of steps to the terrace opposite the centre of the house; the total length of the façade is shown as about 260 ft. The next step was to extend this plan by omitting the terrace and making the colonnades and the advanced wings part of the forecourt, and bringing the flight of steps right up to the main entrance. This was done by the ingenious Captain Wynne, at Buckingham House (since destroyed), built in 1705. The total façade was about 280 ft., but the position of the wings was advanced considerably further up the

[1] Vol. ii., pp. 14 and 26.

[2] Vol. ii., pp. 16, 17, 18, 19. In No. 18 the staircases consist of newels set in the four angles of the central octagon, with no apparent provision for light, except such as could be borrowed from the hall; four of the rooms are shaped as triangles, and out of seventeen rooms eight have no direct light at all. It is impossible that this could have been intended by Inigo Jones as a serious design for an English house.

[3] "Vitruvius Britannicus," vol. iii., p. 9.

forecourt than at Stoke Park. One of these wings contained a kitchen 30 ft. high, with larder, brew-house, and laundry. The other contained servants' quarters, and on the top was a lead cistern "holding fifty tuns of water driven up by an engine from the Thames to supply the water-works in the front court and the gardens." At old Cliefden House, for which Wynne made the original designs, not only were there the two detached blocks forming pavilions in advance of the central block, with the quarter-circle colonnades as usual, but to the right and left of these wings were two more sets of detached buildings, occupied by the stables and offices, with a total frontage of 433 ft.

This form of plan is to be distinguished from the ordinary forecourt plan, such as old Montague House, where the two sides of the forecourt were formed by continuous ranges of building, the distinction between them being that whereas the latter is to all intents a three-sided court, the former consists of three distinct parts, namely, the main block or house proper, and the two detached wings treated as pavilions, with the connecting links given by the quadrant or other colonnade. This plan, as I shall show, was varied in many ways, but the essential feature of it is the separation of the house from the wings, and the subordination of the latter to the main central block in the general composition. It was to this that Sir Joshua Reynolds referred in his encomium on Vanbrugh. "To support his principal object, he produced his second or third groups or masses, he perfectly understood in his art what is the most difficult in ours, the conduct of the background . . . and no architect took greater care than he that his work should not appear crude and hard, that is, it did not abruptly start out of the ground without expectation or preparation." Vanbrugh, as I have pointed out, was not the inventor of this method of design, but he used it very freely and with considerable success. At Blenheim and Castle Howard it is used on a colossal scale, and Vanbrugh undoubtedly succeeded in producing impressive piles of building in his particular manner. It was, however, a very costly method of plan, and extremely inconvenient for all practical purposes. Plans are given in the "Vitruvius Britannicus," in which the only access from the kitchen to dining-room is through a colonnade open on one side to the court, and then through various suites of rooms.[1] At Blenheim, as originally designed, servants going from the kitchen to the hall and dining-room would have to pass first through the open air, and then through interminable corridors, and the same fault appears in the

[1] "Vitruvius Britannicus," vol. v., pp. 50, 83.



PLAN OF MOOR PARK, HERTFORDSHIRE.

plan of Moor Park, and Heythrop in Oxfordshire. It is, of course, necessary to isolate the kitchen and servants' quarters from the big rooms of a house, but such a total disregard of convenience and economy of service as is shown in these eighteenth century plans would not be tolerated for an instant in modern house planning. The point of view has shifted. Vanbrugh and his successors were permitted to subordinate the comfort of the house to its external architecture. They began from without and worked inwards; the entire design was handled with a view to the realization of a certain composition, without regard to convenience of arrangement; and the consequence is that there is always a distinct architectonic conception running through the whole of any one of their designs, which is necessarily absent in the heterogeneous assemblage of buildings which compose most modern country houses.

Notwithstanding the inconvenience of this detached wing plan, it continued in use till the latter part of the eighteenth century, one of the latest important examples being Fonthill in Wiltshire, built by William Beckford before 1771, at a cost of about a quarter of a million. The name of the architect is not given in "Vitruvius Britannicus," iv. 82, 87, but it was probably Paine, who was employed at Wardour Castle in the neighbourhood. Leoni adopted this plan early in the century at Latham Hall in Lancashire, a fine, simple design, with a frontage of 320 ft., somewhat resembling Campbell's rejected design for Goodwood, and again at Moor Park in Hertfordshire. The latter shows a remarkable variation. The wings exceeded in area the central block, and the colonnades to the courts, instead of joining the main block, merely touched its outer angles with their extreme points. They were thus useless for purposes of shelter, but Leoni made them an important feature of his design, for they ran out to the front façade of the wings. The colonnades were on a plan of two segments of a circle, of which the outer and larger segment was some 120 ft. long, and struck with a radius of about 155 ft. The wings have since been pulled down, but the original façade was close on 500 ft. in length, and, with the exception of Blenheim and Castle Howard, this was one of the costliest buildings of its time erected in England.

The ingenuity of the eighteenth century architects was a good deal exercised on this particular form of plan. Sir William Bruce, a skilful Scotch architect, made the colonnades of Hopetown House in Scotland (1698-1702) convex to the court instead of concave as usual. At Duncombe Park in Yorkshire, carried out in 1713 by Wakefield,



J. Gandon del.

M. Darly sculp.

J. Leon Arch.

PLAN OF LATHAM HALL.

from Vanbrugh's design, the main block stands in advance of the detached wings, and this arrangement was repeated by Carr of York in his design for Oakland House, 1762, in which the kitchen, offices, and servants' quarters occupied two wings at the back of the house. In this house, a servant going from the kitchen to the drawing-room had to cross three rooms, go along a corridor, and up a flight of stairs, passing through seven doors on the way. Kent (or Campbell) introduced another variation at Holkham, when he set four detached buildings or wings at the angles of the main block, and connected with it, by single corridors, a somewhat original plan which was not immediately repeated, but which may have indirectly suggested to Paine and Adam the possibility of reproducing Palladio's design for Lionardo Mocenigo at Kedleston.[1] The Kedleston plan shows some important variation from Palladio's, both in regard to the centre block and the treatment of the colonnades and wings. Only the centre and two front wings of Kedleston were built, but in its complete form the Kedleston design consisted of a central block 135 ft. by 105 ft., containing on the principal floor a hall of sixteen columns, 69 ft. 3 in. by 42 ft., with a circular salon beyond, 42 ft. 6 in. in diameter, and 64 ft. high from the floor to the opening of the lantern; to the right of this the dining-room, ante-room, bedrooms, and staircases; to the left, libraries, drawing-room, and music-room. The hall and salon occupy rather more than a third of the centre block. From the extremities of the east and west sides four corridors laid out on a quarter circle communicate with the four wings, each 70 ft. by 53 ft., containing the kitchen, offices, and living rooms in the two north wings, music-rooms, chapel, and other rooms in the south wings. The total length of the façade is 357 ft. In his anxiety to arrive at complete symmetry Adam was driven to some curious straits, for the greenhouse and the chapel together were to form the south-west wing, and in the south-east wing the organ and music gallery were placed immediately above the stables. Adam did, however, place his kitchen within comparatively easy range of the dining-room. Paine adopted a somewhat similar plan in his design for Nostell in Yorkshire, though the internal arrangements are quite different. The central block is an oblong, 162 ft. by 81 ft., connected by quadrant corridors with four square buildings, 50 ft. square, which contain dairies, kitchen, brew-house, and stewards' rooms, billiard room, and bathrooms. The length of the façade is 323 ft. The plan is less complicated than Kedleston,

[1] "Vitruvius Britannicus," iv. 45-51.



TWO PLANS, SAID TO BE FOR MAIDEN BRADLEY, IN WILTS

(*Worcester College Collection*)



WOBURN ABBEY.

(Vitruv. Brit. IV., 22-23)

[to face p. 290

but by no means so well thought out, and the dining-room is most perversely placed in a position almost inaccessible from the kitchen.



PLAN OF GROUND FLOOR, WOBURN, BEDFORDSHIRE. "VITRUVIUS BRITANNICUS," IV. 21.

Eastwell in Kent, by Bonomi (1793-1800), was one of the latest survivals of this plan with advanced wings and quadrants.

The centre block with detached wings was not, however, the only plan in use for larger houses in the latter part of the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries. Inigo Jones, as we have already pointed out, occasionally used internal courts, as at Greenwich. Wren rebuilt part of Hampton Court as a quadrangle, probably, however, out of regard for the older buildings. Talman made an inner court at Chatsworth, 75 ft. by 96 ft., and at Thoresby in Nottinghamshire (1671) an inner court 46 ft. 6 in. by 38 ft. 6 in. At Grimsthorpe in Lincolnshire, Vanbrugh provided an internal court 105 ft. by 78 ft., and Flitcroft designed Woburn Abbey as a great quadrangular court measuring internally 149 ft. 1 in. by 139 ft. 3 in. Small internal courts continued to be used for light and air throughout the eighteenth century, but the growing fondness for top-lighting halls and staircases, and the comparative indifference as to whether light and air were borrowed or obtained direct from without, led to the gradual disuse of the inclosed courts. The three-sided court, so common in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I., hardly outlived the seventeenth century. Maiden Bradley in Wiltshire is probably one of the latest examples of its use in England, and the H-plan disappeared about the same time.[1] By the latter part of the eighteenth century the rectangular block, either square or oblong, with or without attached wings, was fairly established as the accepted plan.

In regard to internal arrangements, Wren and his immediate contemporaries did not materially alter the plan left by Inigo Jones. At Marlborough House Wren placed his hall in the centre, with staircases on either side, and rooms *en suite* beyond, and small newel staircases were provided as well. A somewhat similar arrangement is shown in drawing No. 18 in vol. iv. of the All Souls' Collection of Wren's drawings, and most of Wren's plans in this collection show a great quantity of staircases to reach the separate parts of the house. No. 18 in vol. i. shows an oblong plan divided into three approximately equal parts, of which the centre third is occupied by the hall and staircases. The main staircase is at the back, and allowed a vista through the hall, from the front to the garden door, under the first landing of the stairs.[2] The same idea is shown in drawing No. 24, a design for Lord Allarton, an admirable plan for a moderately sized house. Captain Wynne employed it at New-

[1] This plan is shown in "Vitruvius Britannicus," ii. 56. The plan reproduced from the Worcester Collection has the name Maiden Bradley written on it in a later hand, and is probably the plan of an earlier house than the one given in "Vitruvius Britannicus."

[2] The flight of stairs above this passage to garden door is dotted in the original drawing.



PLAN AND ELEVATION, VOL. I., NO. 18, WREN'S DRAWINGS.
(ALL SOULS' COLLECTION.)

castle House with a slight variation,[1] and in each case, the space provided for staircases is divided into three parts, of which two were assigned to the main stairs and the third to the back stairs. This plan was frequently employed for town houses, towards the end of the seventeenth century. In the "Gentleman's Magazine" for 1814, Part II., John Carter mentions an important house of about this date, which used to stand on the north side of Covent Garden, and which has since been destroyed. His account of the plan resembles that given above: "Hall storey: Entrance front south, giving admission, through a portico taken out of the centre division of the front, into the Hall. Left and right, chambers: in the hall grand stairs, behind the right chamber, back stairs. From centre of hall, a passage to the garden." The principal rooms were on the first floor, elaborately decorated.

At old Buckingham House Wynne followed a different plan. The great staircase was immediately to the left of the entrance hall, and only separated from it by an arcade in three bays. The entrance hall measured 45 ft. by 35 ft., the staircase 43 ft. by 35 ft. The effect of this must have been exceedingly fine. Campbell describes it as "august and lofty," and an account of it, contained in a letter from the Duke of Buckingham the owner, to the Earl of Shrewsbury, is quoted by Carter in the "Gentleman's Magazine" for 1814, Part II. "To the right of the hall was the parlour, 33 ft. by 39 ft., with a niche for a buffet, and beyond this, at the back of the hall and staircase, was a suite of apartments. On the left hand of the hall are three stone arches, supported by Corinthian pillars, under one of which we go up eight-and-forty steps, 10 ft. broad, each step of one entire Portland stone: these stairs, by the help of two resting-places, are so very easy that there is no need of leaning on the iron baluster. The walls are painted with the story of Dido. . . . The roof of this staircase, which is 55 ft. from the ground, is of 40 ft. by 36 ft., filled with the figures of gods and goddesses. . . . The bas-reliefs and little squares above are all episodical paintings of the same story; and the largeness of the whole has admitted of a sure remedy against any decay of colours, from saltpetre in the wall, by making another of oak laths, four inches within it, and so primed over like a picture." Most of this was standing intact when Carter made his survey early in this century. At Finchcox, near Goudhurst, in Kent, a good brick house built before the middle of the eighteenth century, the entrance hall extends from the back to the front of the house, and the

[1] There is a drawing of the plan of Newcastle House, unsigned, in the All Souls' Collection, vol. i., No. 28. See reproduction in chapter viii.



PLAN OF OLD BUCKINGHAM HOUSE.

(Soane Collection)

[to face p. 294



PLANS AMONGST WREN'S DRAWINGS. (ALL SOULS' COLLECTION.)

staircase is on the right hand side, at the further end, but not separated from the hall.

Two characteristic plans are given in Gibbs's "Book of Architecture," published 1728.[1] The first was designed for Lord Litchfield at Ditchley in Oxfordshire. "Here," says Gibbs in the text, "are ten rooms on a floor, besides a great stairs and four back stairs. You ascend ten steps, and enter a hall 31 ft. 6 in. by 35 ft. 2 in. and 34 ft. high, enriched with fretwork and painting. From the hall you go into a dining-room towards the garden, of 23 ft. by 31 ft. 6 in., which has a handsome apartment on the right hand, and on the left a withdrawing room made large, of 36 ft. by 21 ft., with a closet and back stairs. On each side of the hall there is a good apartment, as likewise the great stairs that lead up to the chamber floor, and over that an attick storey. The kitchen offices are on the one side of the house, and the stables on the other, joined by circular covered passages to the house." The second plan is the plan of a house designed by Gibbs for Matthew Prior, which was never carried out, owing to the death of the poet. This plan is as characteristic of the moderate-sized eighteenth century house as Lord Litchfield's is of the larger. Gibbs's description says: "It is 63½ ft. in front by 43½ ft. in depth. From a court of 90 ft. by 78 ft. you ascend three steps and enter . . . a hall 25 ft. square which leads into a pavilion and withdrawing room on one hand, and a library on the other, with great and back stairs. The room over the hall is a cube of 25 ft., and has a bed-chamber and a closet on one side, and two rooms each 16 ft. square on the other. The cube room is lighted on 2 sides from 2 Porticoes of the Dorick order. The offices are on each side of the court, having a covered communication from the house by an arcade."

The most important modifications made by the eighteenth century architects in internal construction are the greatly extended use of top-lighting, and the increased and often unreasonable height given to the rooms. Both modifications on the traditional English methods were due to the same cause. The bent of these architects was academical, that is to say, encouraged and even compelled by their patrons, they were more intent on correctness of scholarship, on strictly orthodox reproductions of Palladian models than on reasonable compliance with the conditions of light and climate inevitable in this country. In so far as fashionable architecture was concerned, there was a positive mania

[1] Plates XXXIX. and LV.

for the Italian manner, and the extreme inconvenience that resulted is evident on an examination of their published designs. Even so practical an architect as Gibbs thought nothing of putting windows under the deep shadows of pediments, or borrowing his light from the top of the hall. In Plate XLIV. of his "Book of Architecture" is a plan of a house, dated 1720, on a square of 90 ft. In this house the passages to the bedrooms were lighted by round openings in the frieze of the great salon, which Gibbs calls "very convenient." If the windows opened the only supply of air to these passages would have been the vitiated air from the top of the salon, and if they were closed there would have been no regular supply of air at all. So again, Campbell, in a design dedicated to the Duke of Argyll, lit the mezzanines containing rooms for the family from the leads in order to preserve the façade from too many windows. At Hopeton House in Scotland (1698) the principal staircase is an octagon in the centre of the building which is approximately square. This octagon is only lit by a large cupola carried up above the flat of the roof, and many variations of this central top-lighted staircase may be found in the plates of the "Vitruvius Britannicus." In certain sites such a staircase may be inevitable, but the disadvantages it presents, insufficient light, and extreme cheerlessness in the lower storeys, ought to prevent its being used where there is plenty of room on the site, and in any but cases of absolute necessity. The fashionable architecture of the eighteenth century was as insincere as its fashionable literature, and it is only in the last forty years that domestic architecture has begun to free itself from some of the worst traditions of eighteenth century planning. Carr of York and Adam were immoderately fond of the top-lit hall, as for instance Adam's work at Kedlestone. In his plans for Thoresby, dated 1770, Carr placed an elliptical hall in the centre of the building, running up two storeys and with direct light only admitted from a light in the top of the cupola; and, as at Oaklands in Cheshire ("Vitruvius Britannicus," v. 17), it appears to have been Carr's habitual practice to place his hall or staircase in the centre of the house, and depend on a cupola for light and air. So popular did this method become that it was regularly adopted in important houses, and instances of it in houses built as late as the middle of the present century are to be found in various parts of England, especially in Yorkshire.

The one case in which it is inevitable is that of a site bounded by adjacent buildings, or a long narrow site which can only get light at the ends. An instance of the first is given in "Vitruvius Britannicus," vol. iv., Plates 4 and 7, Brettingham's design for the Duke of York's Palace

in Pall Mall. The staircase is placed in the centre, and the principal stairs stop at the first floor, above which the staircase chamber is continued without interruption to the lantern, and access to the upper floor is given by a smaller well staircase at one side, in order to avoid any interruption to the light from the lantern above the central staircase. Ware's plan for No. 6, Bloomsbury Square, is more ingenious than Brettingham's. The site is an oblong, and Ware divided this into three unequal parts, the centre being occupied by a staircase up to the first floor as before, with a top light and rooms back and front. Ware, however, instead of making his staircase chamber the full width of the site, has reserved a space at one side which enabled him to provide a passage on all floors from the back rooms to the front, this passage being lit by small circular windows into the main staircase well. For the conditions of the case this plan is quite admirable, and both here and in other instances the eighteenth century architects avoided the error of their successors in so contracting the size of the staircase as to make it appear a mere well with a skylight at the top. It is essential, both for light and architectural effect, that the space assigned to a top-lighted staircase should be as large as possible.

The great height given to the principal rooms in eighteenth century houses has already been referred to. This again was due to the Italian influence. The rules of proportion given by Palladio and others for the various parts of a building were sedulously followed regardless of consequences. In a very high room it is inevitable either that your window must be unduly tall for use, or else so high above the floor that it is impossible to see out of it, or so far below the ceiling that it is unhealthy and very unpleasant to look upon; all of these faults may be found in the designs published by Gibbs and others. Gibbs gives the following rule for the proportion of rooms: "Let length and breadth be added together; half the sum is the height of the room," *e.g.* in a room 20 ft. by 20 ft., the height would be 20 ft., in one 20 ft. by 30 ft., 25 ft., and in a room 20 ft. by 40 ft., the height will be 30 ft., in each case one quarter the height being allowed for the cove to the ceiling. The futility of such an abstract system of proportions, without regard to the specific conditions of the case, was apparent to Gibbs himself, for he adds that in England the height of rooms has to be lowered "in regard to coldness of climate and expense," but it should not be less than the width of the room, minus a quarter, for instance, a room 20 ft. wide should be 15 ft. high.



SECTION OF THE DUKE OF YORK'S HOUSE IN PALL MALL.

(Vitruv. Brit. IV., 7)

[to face p. 298



FROM J. PAINE'S PLANS. ELEVATIONS AND SECTIONS.

Without discussing further the value of these rules for the proportion of rooms, it is sufficient to point out that in the eighteenth century the size and height of rooms were adjusted to considerations of scholarship rather than of practical convenience, and the disastrous results are evident in the absurd height given to the reception rooms of ordinary dwelling-houses built in the early part of this century, such, for instance, as the typical London house of from 1820 to 1850. So long as such men as Gibbs had to do with the design, it was pretty certain that the result, however inconvenient, would possess a certain academical dignity and distinction; but when the mere formulæ of proportion, ill-understood, came into the hands of the very inferior architects and builders of the first half of this century, the inconvenience remains unredeemed from utter dulness by any flash of intelligence or any suggestion of fancy. The one exception to this mechanical system of proportion permitted in the eighteenth century was the great gallery. This, in a somewhat modified form, was allowed to survive from the Jacobean house. The long low gallery, so common in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, with its great range of windows, its pleasant bays, and fretted ceiling, was indeed modified and by no means improved by the increased height given by Vanbrugh and others, but the gallery as an important feature in the house was permitted to survive till the middle of the eighteenth century, and its great length made it impossible to apply to it the exact proportions of the state room and the hall. Gibbs gives no rules of proportion for galleries, except a reference to the double square, though galleries occur in his designs, as, for instance, in Plate XLI. of his "Book of Architecture," which shows a gallery 102 ft. by 25 ft. The only rules that I have come across for the proportion of galleries occur in a curious little book entitled "the city and country purchaser and builder, composed by Stephen Primatt in 1667, and enlarged by William Leybourne in 1680." Primatt says: "The length of galleries ought never to be less than five times their breadth, nor more than eight times. For the height of galleries: if you divide the breadth into three parts, two of them may be for the height, or if higher, divide the breadth into seven parts, and take five of them for the height; both methods are very good proportions." This method of proportion is evidently based on the Jacobean gallery. The gallery at Hatfield, for instance, 163 ft. 6 in. by 19 ft. 6 in. by 15 ft. fulfils it with fair accuracy. Vanbrugh, however, and his successors, seldom observed this rule, and in no instance in the matter of height. The gallery at Castle Howard is 164 ft. by 24 ft. by 24 ft. 6 in. high, that of Wentworth Castle, 180 ft.

by 24 ft. by 30 ft. high, that of Chatsworth, 103 ft. by 30 ft. by 22 ft., and that of Holkham, 105 ft. by 21 ft. by 23 ft. The gallery of Bridgewater House, a late example, is 94 ft. by 24 ft. by 22 ft.[1] The galleries found in the work of the Adams are, as compared with the seventeenth century instances, galleries only in name; for, in fact, they are great reception-rooms arranged *en suite*, and for purposes of spectacle, rather than the long, low corridor of the Elizabethan house. Here, as in the case of the living rooms and house planning generally, the tendency of the eighteenth century architect was to make his design more and more artificial, to remove it from the conditions of actual use and convenience, and to seek for his effect in the pedantic satisfaction of arbitrary canons of proportion and design, rather than in the free and unaffected expression of the purpose of his building and his own individuality.

It is to be noted, however, that throughout the eighteenth century a great quantity of excellent domestic work was done, in which the common sense and reasonableness of design is as conspicuous as in any work of the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries. The passion for a rigorous adherence to the rules of the art was confined to architects of reputation, and though it eventually superseded the old building tradition of the country, there is abundant evidence in many a quiet house in town and country that the simplicity of taste and the kindly humour which gave its charm to the seventeenth century manor house was not extinct in the eighteenth century. In the dainty panelling of the hall, the delicate adjustment of unobtrusive detail in windows and cornice, cupboards and mantelpieces, there is more refinement, if less fancy, than in the earlier work, and a precision of workmanship peculiar to the eighteenth century. It would be hard to find in any country a more lovable or more entirely habitable dwelling-house than the plain red-brick house, with its wooden cornice and white sash windows, which continued to be built in England up to about the end of the eighteenth century. It makes no pretence of ambitious architecture, probably it was not the work of an architect at all, but designed and built by some country builder, who had learnt his craft from his father and his grandfather before him, men possibly who had worked under Wren in days when the amateur had not yet usurped the control of architecture. With all our admiration for the knowledge and ability of the English architects of the eighteenth century, one finds the last trace of the English tradition of building not in their designs, but in the unacknowledged work of the country builder, the unpretending endeavour of the architect unknown.

[1] These dimensions are taken from published prints.

CHAPTER XIII.

Architectural Literature, Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.

Wotton's "Elements of Architecture" was the last English treatise on the art that appeared before the Civil War, and it fitly epitomizes the homely, almost provincial view of architecture that prevailed in this country till Inigo Jones introduced design in the grand manner. One leaves this older theory of architecture with regret, as the last word of the bright wayward fancy, partly old world, partly modern, which seems characteristic of the age of Elizabeth; yet to a master, such as Inigo Jones, this point of view must have seemed merely immature, and his genius was too austere to recognize any value in the caprices of partly trained intelligence. His work was thorough, and from the date of his death till the publication of Stuart and Revett's "Athenian Antiquities," a succession of treatises on architecture appeared, every one of which assumed, as a matter of course, that by architecture must be meant Italian architecture, and more particularly the architecture of Andrea Palladio.

It is probable that Inigo Jones himself contemplated a book on architecture. Among his miscellaneous papers he left a considerable quantity of notes on the details of classical design, and Leoni was to have published these with his translation of "Palladio." They did not appear, however, till the third edition of Leoni's work. The only published work of Inigo Jones was his account of Stonehenge, published posthumously by Webb, which has little relation to architecture, and is only interesting as an instance of the singular aberrations possible to a man of first-rate artistic genius when he goes outside his subject. It was not till 1663 that the series of architectural handbooks began again with a translation of the first book of "Palladio," by Godfrey Richards, with an appendix on doors and windows, and another on wooden parquet floors, and the forms and scantlings of roofs and other timber construction. Richards's translation went through at least six editions; it was translated out of French by Richards, and illustrated by about seventy

copper engravings. The appendix on doors and windows and the proportions of rooms was taken from Le Muet, architect to Louis XIV., and the rules as to roofs were drawn up by "that ingenious architect Mr. William Pope of London." This was followed in 1664 by Evelyn's translation of Fréart's "Parallels," one of the most valuable treatises on the details of Renaissance architecture ever written. Fréart collected his materials on the spot. He was sent to Italy by Desnoyers Baron Dangu, Secretary of State under Richelieu, with instructions to impress Italian artists and to collect casts of the antique. Fréart availed himself of his opportunity to make an exhaustive study of the various manners of the great Italian architects. The full title of his work is "A Parallel of architecture, both ancient and moderne," and his method is to take the details of actual examples of the five orders found in Roman buildings, such as the theatre of Marcellus, the Temple of Fortuna Virilis, etc., and to compare these with the details and proportions given by the following ten principal authors who have written upon the five orders—Palladio, Scamozzi, Serlia, Vignola, Barbaro, Cataneo, Alberti, Viola, Bullant, and De l'Orme. These writers are treated in pairs in the order given, Fréart assigning chief authority to Palladio, Barbaro, and Alberti, and placing the two Frenchmen last, not as inferior, but in order to separate them from the Italians. Each order is taken separately, and after the examples of antiquity have been given, the principles and proportions prescribed by the modern authors are described with a uniform system of proportion, in order to render comparison easy. The Tuscan and Composite orders are separated from the three principal orders, and treated of in a separate part, as being Latin inventions and altogether inferior to the Greek originals. Fréart's account contains some judicious criticisms, and he anticipates the objection that an architect is not to be bound by the rules of antiquity, in terms which are curiously appropriate to the attempts at original architecture which have been made in the last fifty years in England. He answers boldly, that to be a master in architecture it is not necessary to produce something new, that it is a mistake to suppose that "by fantastically designing some one kind of particular cornice, or like member, they are presently the inventors of a new order . . . . as if the Pantheon, that same stupendous and incomparable structure, were not the invention of the architect who built it because he has vary'd nothing from the Corinthian ordinance of which it is entirely composed. 'Tis not in the retail of the minuter portions that the talent of an architect appears; this is to be judg'd from the general distribution of the whole work."

Evelyn follows suit by a remark in the dedication to Sir John Denham, that "all the mischiefs and absurdities in our modern structures proceed chiefly from our busie and Gotic triflings in the compositions of the Five orders." He even ventures the speculation that "it is from the assymetrie of our buildings, want of decorum and proportion in our houses, that the irregularity of our humours and affections may be shrewdly discerned;" and he comments severely on the workmen who, "for want of canons to proceed by . . . . fill as well whole cities as private houses with rubbages and a thousand infirmities." To Fréart's treatise Evelyn has added a glossary of architectural terms and a translation of Alberti's treatise on statues. Evelyn was rather a prig, and was occasionally thrown off his balance in his anxiety to flatter those in high places, but his judgment was sound, and there can be little doubt that in publishing this treatise he did a great service to the architecture of his time. His translation supplied exact models of the orders in a form easily intelligible to builders and workmen, and by calling attention to the fact that there is such a thing as grammar in architecture, and that it is unsafe for anyone but a man of genius to attempt to reconstruct its language, he helped to restore architecture to its rightful place as a learned art. He was indeed ahead of the most advanced ideas of modern educational reform, in so far as he insisted that some knowledge of architecture should have a place in any reasonable system of education.

In 1669 Robert Pricke brought out a translation of Francini's "Livre d'Architecture," published at Paris in 1621; in 1675 a translation of Le Muet's "Manière de bien Bastir" (Paris, 1623); and in 1676 "A New Treatise of Architecture," translated from J. Mauclerc's "Le Premier Livre d'Architecture." "The art of Fair building"[1] is a series of thirty-one folio plates, somewhat roughly engraved, showing plans, elevations, and sections of various French houses, designed by Mansard, Le Muet, Pouget, and others; such as Tanlay in Burgundy, Chavigny in Touraine, and a house of M. Davaux in Paris, which resembles Wren's original design for Marlborough House. There is no letterpress. Mauclerc, who was a gentleman of Poitou, published his book at La Rochelle in 1600. It is a treatise on the five orders and all their details, with excellent folio plates, very finely engraved, and fantastic introductions.

[1] The full title is "The art of Fair building, wherein are augmentations of the newest buildings made in France, by the designs and ordering of Monsieur Le Muet and others."

"The City and Country Purchaser and Builder," composed by Stephen Primatt in 1667, and enlarged by William Leybourne in 1680, is again purely technical. It was originally written as a manual of valuations, to settle the constant disputes as to the value of house property occasioned by the Great Fire, and the second book was composed as a model specification and schedule of prices for intending builders. The third book, added by Leybourne, contains a few rules for the proportion and distribution of rooms, and various methods of measuring up builders' work. The book contains some useful information as to the state of the building trades in the time of Wren, but has little or no reference to the art of architecture, a want which Leybourne attempted to supply by "The Mirror of Architecture," a series of extracts from Scamozzi, "whereby the principal points of architecture are easily and plainly demonstrated for the benefit of all Lovers and ingenious Practitioners in the said art." This book was published towards the end of the seventeenth century,[1] with plates re-engraved from the Italian originals by Joachim Schuym, a Dutchman. With the exception of the plates, it is a worthless compilation. The letterpress does not tally with the plates, and the instructions on the latter, partly in Dutch, partly in English, are unintelligible, and certainly do not "make plain the principal rules of architecture to ordinary capacities," as the book professed to do. Leybourne, who was a barrister, appears to have had no practical knowledge of his subject, and possibly did not understand his own translations.

No attempt had yet been made to produce an independent and original treatise on the art of architecture. The authority of Palladio was accepted as beyond dispute by English writers, and Aldrich, as an amateur of architecture, was not the man to leave the beaten track. His "Elements of Civil Architecture" is a disappointing book. Aldrich was a scholar, a musician, and a man of wide and varied attainment, interested in the arts, and so far skilled in architecture as to be capable of designing a work of such distinct individuality as the Church of All Saints, Oxford; yet he hardly ventures on any views of his own on the theory and practice of architecture, and practically confines himself to a series of elementary notes and definitions, taken from Vitruvius, Pliny, Columella, and Palladio, with a few technical criticisms on the proportion and principles of Alberti and other Italians. His point of view is entirely academical; considerations of convenience, of light and air, and

[1] The fourth edition is dated 1700.

the actual working of an English house, went for nothing with the Oxford scholar. He was entirely occupied with the orders, and such theories of Greek and Roman architecture as could be gleaned from the Latin writers and Palladio. One looks in vain in his treatise for any glimpse of the shrewd, practical sense of Wotton. For instance, in dealing with private houses, the point on which he insists is not that the plan should be workable as well as dignified, but that all doors and windows shall be exactly symmetrical, *ut utique vacuum vacuo immineat, et plenum pleno;* and if, as Wotton pointed out, this is inconvenient, back stairs must be interspersed where necessary. Aldrich would probably have regarded with horror the possibility of modern iron construction and its habitual disregard of this rule. So again, in dealing with doors, he quotes without comment Palladio's rule that they should be from 2 to 3 ft. wide by 5 to 6 ft. 6 in. high, and insists that they should be 2 ft. 6 in. by 5 ft. 6 in. It is evident that the practical intention of the door as a means of communication was not in his consciousness at all. Though, however, writers such as Aldrich seem on occasion utterly wide of the mark, there was sound theory behind this attempt at an exact system of proportions in architecture. Some such system is essential, not necessarily any one given set of mechanical rules, but that rhythmical relationship between all the parts of a design which is in fact proportion, and it is the neglect of this, and the extreme reaction to mere utilitarianism on the one hand, and mere ornament on the other, which makes most modern buildings architecturally worthless. For architecture is neither simple building nor a haphazard collection of ornament. It is built up like a symphony in music, based on a comprehensive scheme of thought consistently maintained, and it involves an organic structure in idea, quite apart from the material conditions of buildings. It is on their recognition of this essential principle rather than in their dogmatic formulæ that the value of these systems rest. Moreover, they place on record the practice of the very ablest artists. Palladio's rules of proportion, though necessarily incapable of universal application, at least embody a system, and at best the results of the experience of an extremely thoughtful and capable architect.

Aldrich was one of the first of the Restoration writers to see the necessity of adhering to simple models if the dangers of exuberant invention were to be avoided. Of twisted columns, for instance, he says, "*columnæ tortiles, quosque vocant cartoccios et scapi annulis revincti, quasi fracti essent et refarciti, omnino fugiantur;*" and again, of the undue use of sculpture, "*cælatura nimia venustatem opprimit;*" and it is not

too much to say that this resolute insistence on severe and rigorously correct design, in which all the responsible writers and architects of the beginning of the eighteenth century were agreed, saved this country from the monstrous aberrations of rococo architecture. While continental architecture was rapidly degenerating into all the folly of decadence, the standard of simple and refined art was maintained in this country for another fifty years. In this regard there is some ground for Woolfe and Gandon's boast that "architecture was brought to as great a point of perfection in this kingdom in the eighteenth century as ever it was known to be among the Greeks and Romans, and that if we were not inferior to the ancients in this respect, we far surpassed our contemporaries of every other country."[1]

We now come to the age of the great folio publications, so characteristic of the eighteenth century in their magnificent display, their fastidious workmanship, their effort after precision, or a semblance of it, at any cost. Nothing is left to the imagination, the delightful and suggestive sketchiness of the illustrations to the great Italian treatises was abandoned as immature, possibly also because the man did not live who could do such work again. In its place we have elaborate steel or copper engravings of absolute mechanical finish, and if perspective drawings are given they are, as a rule, scientific exercises, without any pretence to artistic feeling. But notwithstanding these limitations, these works are of great value in the history of English architecture, and the real claim of Lord Burlington to the respect of lovers of that art rests on the munificent assistance which he gave to their publication.

"L'Antichiti di Roma," published at Oxford in 1709, was probably the earliest; but the best known of the whole series is the "Vitruvius Britannicus," of which the first two volumes were issued by Campbell in 1715 and 1717, and the third in 1725; the two final volumes were published by Woolfe and Gandon in 1767.[2] One approaches this work of Campbell's with feelings partly of gratitude, partly of dislike. It was undoubtedly a fine idea to undertake to place on record most of the important buildings of his time, and to the student of English eighteenth century architecture the work is simply invaluable. The labour involved in such an enterprise must have been stupendous, and whatever faults there may have been in Campbell's temper and judgment, he was certainly a capable architect and a good draughtsman. The fault of

[1] Introduction to "Vitruvius Britannicus," vols. iv. and v., 1767.

[2] A continuation in two volumes was published by G. Richardson in 1802, under the title of the "New Vitruvius Britannicus."

the book is its partisan spirit. It was compiled with the double object of setting the fashion for Palladianism pure and simple, and of gaining the favour of Campbell's friends and patrons, and it is quite possible that Lord Burlington suggested the general lines of the scheme. The consequence is that Campbell's series, which professed to be representative, is distinctly partial and one-sided. Only a single instance is given of Wren's domestic work, and Gibbs is not mentioned at all. Moreover, the inspiration is evidently that of the virtuoso rather than of the artist. Though Campbell could tolerate the outlandish experiments of Vanbrugh, he had no sympathy with the graceful fancy of Wren, or with his frank disregard of merely pedantic considerations. To Campbell it seemed a matter of more importance that windows should be "dressed in the Palladian manner" than that they should properly light the house, and the fashion so set, the anxiety to please the virtuoso and the connoisseur rather than the artist, seriously diminish the value of these eighteenth century publications; admirable as they are in the scholarship and thoroughness of their execution. Campbell's method was to issue plans, elevations, and sections to scale of the buildings illustrated, with brief introductory descriptions. Each of his three volumes contains a hundred plates, and among them (with the grave exceptions already noted) are to be found most of the principal domestic buildings erected in England between the time of Inigo Jones and the death of Sir Christopher Wren. Instances are given of works by Inigo Jones, John Webb, Captain Wynne, Talman, Archer, Vanbrugh, Hawksmoor, James, and others, with many designs of Campbell's own invention. The third volume contains various perspective views and some elaborate plans of gardens and plantations.

This third volume was not published till 1725, and the explanation of the new departure is to be found in the fact that James's translation of "The Theory and Practice of Gardening" had appeared in 1712, and called attention to the elaborate system of garden design then practised in France, and to some considerable extent in England. The relation between garden design and architecture I have discussed elsewhere,[1] and though the two have since parted company, there is abundant historical evidence to show that at the beginning of the eighteenth century the inseparable connection of the two was assumed as a matter of course. It is only possible, in fact, to form a just and adequate estimate of English architecture of the early part of the eighteenth century by

[1] "The Formal Garden in England," Macmillan, 1892.

considering the house and grounds as part and parcel of one conception, and much of the quality of these magnificent designs has been lost through the destruction of the terraces, avenues, and forecourts which were essential to their full effect, and to the justification of a manner in architecture possibly alien to the natural scenery of England. The point was very clearly realized at the time. The long avenues of approach were deliberately intended to prepare the mind for the great extent of formal garden, and for the house as the final and complete expression of a scheme which was honestly and avowedly artificial from first to last. Kip's great folio of views of noblemen's seats was published under the title of "Britannia Illustrata" in 1709. It was followed in 1712 by John James's translation of "The Theory and Practice of Gardening," from the French of Le Blond or D'Argenville Dezalliers. This work is entirely based on the system of Lenôtre, and deals with the disposition and general distribution of gardens, including parterres, walks, bowling greens, terraces, and stairs, and the various details of the pleasure garden as then understood. Stephen Switzer published an inferior book on somewhat similar lines in 1718, but the manner was already dying out; and with the introduction of landscape gardening about the middle of the eighteenth century, the divorce between house and grounds became final. It is noticeable that the disappearance of the formal method of garden design was more or less contemporary with the final break-up of the older tradition of regular architecture in England.

James also translated Perrault's "Treatise of the Five Orders" in 1707, and Pozzi's "The Rules and Examples of Perspective" in 1710. Though he does not appear to have produced any original treatise on architecture, James possessed more literary capacity than any of his successors, who (with the exception of Leoni, Ware, and Chambers) usually confined their efforts to the publication of elaborate folio engravings. Leoni's first edition of "Palladio" was published 1715-16, but it is not very easy to see what part he took in this first edition of 1715, for the translation is in French and was made by Nicholas Dubois, one of his majesty's engineers. There are no plates, and Inigo Jones's notes on Palladio, which were announced for publication, were not included in this edition or in that of 1725, and did not finally appear till the third edition in 1741-42. The second edition of 1725 is in English, whether from the French of Dubois by an anonymous translator, or put into English by Dubois himself, does not appear. In the preface, Dubois, who speaks contemptuously of Palladio's admirable woodcuts, says that Leoni had spent several years in preparing the designs from

which the plates in the second edition were engraved, and adds ominously, "as he (Leoni) is an excellent designer, he has taken care to add to all those original designs many ornaments which could not appear in wooden cuts. . . . . Thus the Reader may see how much the public is indebted to Mr. Leoni." Dubois makes the curious blunder of treating Roland Fréart and M. de Chambray as two separate persons, being apparently not aware that Roland Fréart was also Sieur de Chambray. He is severe on the inaccuracies of the English version of Le Muet's translation of the first book of Palladio, but the pains which Leoni took to re-draw Palladio's designs deprived his illustrations of all their value, and justify Ware's criticism, that Leoni so altered the scale and varied the proportions of the original designs that his book is quite untrustworthy. The third edition of 1742 included Inigo Jones's observations, inaccurately transcribed from the MS. notes in his Palladio in Worcester College Library, a translation of Palladio's notes on the antiquities of Rome, and his discourse on the fires of the ancients, in which Palladio advocated the hypocaust of the Romans, and remarked that stoves are "an abominable invention. They cause a continual stench, swell the head, and make men drowsy, dull, and lazy." In 1726 Leoni translated Cosimo Bartoli's Italian verson of Alberti's ten books on architecture, three books on painting, and one on statuary. All the drawings were re-engraved by Picart, and much altered from the originals. At the end of the translation come various designs by Leoni, with an extremely vigorous preface, in which he inveighs against the impostors who denied the necessity of drawing in an architect, and points out the various faults in building, due to the inability of the architect to put his designs into perspective. "The modern Fabricks, which we most commonly meet with, are indeed little else but great heaps of stone piled up one upon another . . . . ornaments thrown together at haphazard. . . . Huge halls and strait chambers. . . . Houses that may be said to be without staircases, and staircases without houses, doors wide enough for the house to go out at, etc.," and he asks pertinently, how is it possible to have one man's idea transcribed by another man's hand, when thought and its expression are indissoluble, and the idea grows to maturity in the actual process of getting it out on to paper. Leoni here touches on a point of permanent interest in the practice of architecture. All fine architecture must be the personal expression of an idea, and the more complex the conditions under which architecture works, the greater the necessity of this intimate association between the idea and its expression. In the days of a less advanced and less

complicated civilization, when tradition was strong, and one method of expression was more or less inevitable, it is possible to conceive that William of Wykeham's might have merely indicated his idea, and had it successfully carried out by other hands and other minds. It is not possible to conceive that such delegation can be satisfactory when tradition is uncertain and the methods of expression manifold. Leoni has here laid his finger on one of the real sources of weakness in modern architecture. In his time an architect was still considered to be an artist who undertook personal work, rather than a professional man who conducted a business. By the end of the eighteenth century, however, the conditions had changed. The professional view was completely established, and this view has been so generally accepted, that it is now by no means uncommon for architects to delegate the whole of their design to an army of clerks and draughtsmen.

In 1728 R. Castell published his "Villas of the Ancients," a disquisition on Pliny's Laurentian and Tuscan villas, and the villas described by Varro and Columella, with elaborate and very well-executed engravings. The book can have been of little use to architects, and has been superseded by more exact scholarship, but it is remarkable as the first attempt on the part of an English scholar at the theoretical restoration of ancient building, a branch of research which has since been more systematically pursued in France than in England. Walpole says that Lord Burlington found the money for these sumptuous works. In 1730 Lord Burlington printed for private circulation the "Fabbriche antiche designate da Andrea Palladio," a series of facsimile reproductions by Ware and Fourdrinier of Palladio's restorations of the various Roman baths. It is probable that Burlington also supplied the funds for Kent's publication of designs by Inigo Jones in 1727. Kent's share in this publication is characteristic of the man. The work was issued in two volumes, containing seventy-three and sixty-four plates respectively. The first fifty-two plates of the first volume are devoted to the Whitehall designs, and the remaining plates to miscellaneous designs attributed to Inigo Jones, Kent, and Burlington. The second volume contains various designs which, with one or two exceptions, are not named, and which are assigned to Inigo Jones without any means of identification, and some further designs attributed to Lord Burlington. None of the plates are facsimile copies of original drawings, but, according to the mischievous habit of the time, they were all engraved by Hulsbergh or Fourdrinier from drawings by Flitcroft. Kent prudently considered the task too difficult for his own sloppy draughtsmanship, and confined

his share of the work to selecting the drawings to be engraved, and arranging the details of publication. Unfortunately, however, in his anxiety to produce an imposing work, he overlooked the necessity of critical study and historical honesty. As a record of Inigo Jones's designs the book is not to be trusted. The Whitehall designs, as published, are a compilation from fragments left by Inigo Jones, and various drawings made by John Webb, with large lacunæ supplied by Kent, and details to the taste of the draughtsman.[1] Kent presents these plates without a word of warning as the authentic designs of Inigo Jones, but it is impossible to accept them as such. Lord Burlington had a fine collection of miscellaneous architectural drawings, and Kent found a convenient label in the name of Inigo Jones. Lord Burlington may have believed in their genuineness, but it is hard to imagine that Kent was imposed upon in the matter. The element of charlatanism which appears elsewhere in Kent's career heightens the suspicion with which one is driven to regard the honesty of this publication. The hand of the great English master in architecture is visible here and there, but in several of the designs as given, there is a total absence of his pre-eminent distinction of style.

Meanwhile, Gibbs had been ignored both by Campbell and Kent, and he accordingly published in 1728 a "Book of Architecture, containing designs of Buildings and ornaments." In his introductory remarks, Gibbs says that his book is written "with the object of being a pattern book to gentlemen building in remote parts, where designs are not easily obtained, and of providing working drawings of buildings and ornaments, to be executed by any workman who understands lines." He refers to the folly of people who build without an architect, "what heaps of stone and even marble," he says, "are daily seen in monuments, chimneys, and other ornamental pieces of architecture, without the least symmetry or order. . . . For it is not the Bulk of a Fabric, the richness and quantity of the materials, the multiplicity of lines, nor the gaudiness of the Finishing, that give the grace or Beauty and Grandeur to a building, but the proportion of the parts to one another and to the whole." Gibbs then proceeds to give a series of plates representing all his principal works then executed, St. Martin's in the Fields, St. Mary le Strand, the Marylebone Chapel, All Hallows, Derby, the steeple of St. Clement Danes, various draughts for steeples, his designs for work at Cambridge, and various important houses, such as Ditchley and Milton,

[1] See, for instance, the details of Plates XX. and XXXVII., vol. i.

and details of obelisks, columns, gate-piers and monuments. The plates were engraved by Hulsbergh, Harris, Kirkall and Mynde, from drawings by Gibbs himself. In 1735 Gibbs supplemented this by a book of "rules for drawing the several parts of architecture." This book gives rules for the porportions of every part of the orders, for the use of orders above orders and inter-columniations, with very complete drawings of each member, including ornamental details, such as the egg and dart, the guilloche, etc. Proportions are given for rooms and ceilings, and in every case directions are given for setting out every possible architectural detail in the classical manner, as then understood, by geometrical methods and an exact system of proportions. Sixty-four plates accompany the letterpress. It is on the whole an exceedingly useful book, and any intelligent builder who took the pains to work out these instructions could turn out an indefinite quantity of reasonable classical detail. Both these books had a wide circulation at the time, and partly account for the correct proportion found in the vernacular work of the eighteenth century. Gibbs's latest publication was the "Bibliotheca Radcliviana," a complete account of the Radcliffe Library at Oxford, with twenty-three copper-plates engraved by Fourdrinier, which appeared in 1747.

The eighteenth century architects were not deterred by any undue modesty from publishing their own designs. Campbell, Kent, and Gibbs had done so without scruple, and the example was readily followed. Flitcroft published a plate of his design for Wentworth House, which appeared at the end of the 1770 edition of Kent's "Inigo Jones." In 1735 Isaac Ware published the designs of Rookby Hall in Yorkshire, and in the same year the plans, elevation, and sections of Houghton in Norfolk by Ripley and Kent, Campbell's name being suppressed, another instance of the unscrupulous or uncritical carelessness with which these works were compiled. Campbell, however, was unintentionally avenged by Brettingham, who published the designs of Holkham in 1761 as his own, though Walpole indignantly claims them for Kent. The motive of these works can have been little else than advertisement. Paine, who was an honest and somewhat cynical person, says frankly in his preface, that one of the objects of his publication was "to obtain his share of the applause which was being so liberally bestowed on the architecture of the time;" and though possibly harmless in themselves, they increased the tendency to paper architecture which had already begun, that is to say, the attention of the architect tended to concentrate itself on drawings as an end in

themselves, rather than as a mere means and instrument of building. Some of the fantastic experiments made in the last hundred years could hardly have been possible, if architects had kept in constant touch with actual building, and had kept in sight the fundamental fact that, no matter how excellent his drawings, his actual buildings are what an architect must stand or fall by. The custom of making elaborate perspectives of buildings, and of attaching importance to paper design, is to a large extent the growth of the present century. It has produced the architectural draughtsman, but has had a disastrous influence on the development of architecture.

In 1735 Ware published some further designs by Inigo Jones and others, in fifty-three plates. This includes the designs for the Barber Surgeons' Hall, the altar-piece and screen in the chapel of old Somerset House, and details of Chiswick and Ashburnham House; but here again, and in Vardy's "Designs by Mr. Inigo Jones and Mr. William Kent," published in 1744, it is impossible to feel any confidence as to the authenticity of the work. Ware assigns to Inigo Jones the alcove at Ashburnham House, which is certainly later; in fact, it is doubtful whether Jones had anything to do with the design of this house; and Vardy assigns to Inigo Jones an alcove and certain mantel-pieces at Greenwich, which are known by the original drawings to have been by John Webb. Ware, however, did better work than this. In 1738 he issued his translation of the four books of Palladio. The preface, dated Scotland Yard, 1737, refers to Leoni's translation, and another work (published in the year 1735), done with so little understanding and so much negligence, that it was perfectly worthless.[1] Ware, in order to do Palladio justice, traced his woodcuts and engraved them himself with exact fidelity to the originals. In 1756 Ware issued the final result of his studies and experience in "The Complete Body of Architecture," a vast folio of 748 pages. His object was to collect in one treatise all remarks in previous authors bearing upon architecture, with additions and comments of his own. Hitherto, he points out, with a side glance at Campbell and Gibbs, writers had "considered the magnificence of building rather than its use," and he now proposed to call attention to the use and necessity of architecture, and with this end in view, to give information, first about materials of all sorts, and afterwards about their right use and disposition. In regard to this latter part of his scheme Ware adhered more or less to the orthodox manner. The size of doors

[1] I cannot ascertain what "work" Ware refers to, unless it was one of Morris's publications.

and windows, for instance, was to be determined solely by fixed rules of proportion; but Ware's theory of architecture is more reasonable than that of his predecessors, for he divided architecture into two parts, first, that which is fixed by rule, and, secondly, that which is left to individual fancy; and his theory was that the architect should use his own inventions in the disposition of the building, but that having arrived at a general scheme of design in regard to plan and elevation according to his fancy, and the conditions of the case, he was to subordinate the proportions and details of his building to the accepted rules of classical design. Ware was evidently breaking away from the rigid pedantry of the *virtuosi*. "The custom," he says, "among English architects has been to observe these (models) too implicitly, to transfer the buildings of Italy, right or wrong, suited or unsuited to the purpose, into England, and this, if done exactly, the builder has been taught to consider as merit in his profession. Let him study those designs, but have some regard to his own genius." In spite of a tendency to platitude, Ware's was a distinct advance on previous work. It was written by an architect of wide knowledge and great practical capacity, and supplies what is wanting in modern text-books of building construction, viz., clear diagrams of the orders, with sections, plans, and elevations, and model designs, showing these orders in use in various executed buildings. It is useless to expect the employment of competent architects in any but a small number of the buildings erected in this country, but a well-selected pattern book, such as Ware's, brought up to date, and modified to suit the conditions of modern building, might perhaps save the speculative builder and others from the worst and most ignoble of their attempts at ornament.

If, as appears likely, Robert Morris was the writer referred to by Ware, the criticism was well-deserved, for Morris attempted a literary and philosophical treatment of architecture, and from either point of view his work is worthless. In 1728 he published an "essay in defence of ancient architecture," in which he contended that the faults of contemporary work were due to neglect of the orthodox proportions, and in 1734 he published fifteen lectures on architecture, read to a society started by himself for "the improvement of knowledge in arts and sciences." The lectures are most tedious and rhetorical, and Morris at intervals breaks out into long descriptions in verse, for he was a poet in his way, and wrote a tragedy entitled "Fatal Necessity." His other works included an essay on harmony in relation to sites and buildings, "Rural Architecture" (fifty plates of designs), 1750, "The Architectural

Remembrancer," 1751 (fifty plates), "Architecture Improved," 1755, and "Select Architecture," 1759, fifty more miscellaneous designs. Morris's designs are as weak and pretentious as his letterpress, they are less interesting than the "Twelve Designs for Farmhouses," by William Halfpenny, published with the "Remembrancer," in 1750; these having the additional merit of being accompanied by priced bills of quantities to each design. Halfpenny[1] also published some handbooks of architecture, but none of these works are of any particular importance, and only one other serious attempt was made in the eighteenth century to treat of architecture from a more or less technical standpoint. In 1759 Chambers published his "Treatise of Civil Architecture," a book which, with all its faults of style and method, has retained its place to this day as one of the best introductions to modern classical architecture yet written in England. Chambers's original intention had been to supplement this work with a treatise on the practical details of architecture, such as building materials and construction, but he never carried this into effect, and re-issued his book under the title of "A Treatise on the Decorative Part of Civil Architecture," in 1791. In his preface Chambers says that his object was "to select from mountains of promiscuous materials a series of sound precepts and perfect designs . . . without bias from national or other prejudices." After some preliminary remarks on the qualifications of an architect, and a sketch of the history of building from the earliest times, which has all the curious mixture of large generalization and inaccurate fact characteristic of eighteenth century scholarship, Chambers proceeds to a minute and exhaustive disquisition on the orders and other details of Roman architecture, interspersed with criticisms on the rules laid down by other authors, and on actually executed examples. Chambers's point of view was quite definite. He was an unhesitating adherent of antiquity, and by antiquity he understood Roman models in preference to Greek. He held that the orders are as the words of an old language fixed irrevocably for all time, "the suppression of parts of the ancient orders with a view to produce novelty has of later years been practised among us with full as little success," and he deprecated all such attempts as

[1] In conjunction with Morris and Lightoler, Halfpenny published the "Modern Builders' Assistant." He also published "A New and Complete System of Architecture," a handbook of Palladian proportions entitled, "Magnum in Parvo or the Marrow of Architecture," and "Practical Architecture."

Batty Langley was another voluminous writer of the time on architecture and garden design. A list of the more important of his works will be found in the Appendix: none of them are of sufficient value to warrant a detailed account.

dangerous experiments. Elsewhere he says, "the antique is to the architect what Nature is to the painter or sculptor, the source from which his chief knowledge must be collected, the model from which his taste must be formed;" and in regard to the Greeks he pronounced that they were distinctly inferior to the Romans, both in "proportions and in the art of profiling," a remark based on the publications of Stuart, Revett, and others, for Chambers never went to Greece in his life. Within his own limits, however, Chambers was very learned, and his book is rich in information on all the details of classical architecture. Moreover, his advice is always in favour of restraint in ornament and simplicity in design, and a vein of strong common sense runs through all his criticisms. The book is very well illustrated, but it has to be borne in mind that the sections and details given are the result of Chambers's selection from various models, and that in several instances he by no means improved on his authorities, notably in the Ionic order, where he has substituted a flat frieze for the pulvinated frieze of Palladio.

The last treatise on the Orders published in the eighteenth century was issued by G. Richardson in 1787. It contains twenty-two plates executed in aquatint, but the work is of no value. Richardson was a voluminous architectural compiler who followed the fashion. In his Orders he introduced Greek details as understood at the time, and in his "Book of Ceilings," published in 1776, "composed in the style of the antique-grotesque," he followed the manner of Adam. His ceilings are thin and wiry in design, and neither better nor worse than those of the architect whom he imitated. Richardson published various other folios, more particularly a continuation of the "Vitruvius Britannicus" in 1802. The plates are in aquatint, and both in execution and in the buildings illustrated are very inferior to the original series.

The only attempt made to follow Ware's lead in regard to technical information was made by William Pain, "Architect and Joiner," who published in 1789 "The Practical House Carpenter," followed by "The Practical Builder." Both of these are pattern books. They contain complete details of doors, windows, shop fronts, roof construction, staircases, and other parts of the house, which details seem to have been freely used by builders at the end of the last century. In the streets to the west of Lincoln's Inn Fields and near Long Acre, there are still to be seen various doorways and old shop fronts almost identical in design with those published by Pain. While the *virtuosi* and architects were making bad copies of Greek architecture, builders

and workmen were still doing work which was not unworthy of the older tradition of architecture in England. Pain also published in 1786 "The British Palladio," with forty-two folio plates engraved "from the original designs by William and James Pain," a somewhat haphazard collection of ornament and details of building construction as applied to houses. The letterpress is exiguous, and the taste of the designs indifferent.

Meanwhile architects continued to publish their own works with unabated ardour. In 1751 James Paine (not to be confounded with the architect and joiner) published his designs for the mansion house at Doncaster, and in 1767 two folio volumes of engravings of buildings erected from his designs in various parts of England, followed by an enlarged edition in 1783. The plates in these volumes have been already referred to in my account of Paine. The first volume consists of plans, elevations, and sections, engraved to scale, of buildings in the counties of Derby, Durham, Middlesex, Northumberland, Notts, and York; the second volume includes his work in Notts, Essex, Wilts, Derby, Herts, Suffolk, Shropshire, Middlesex, and Surrey. Short technical descriptions accompany each set of plates. The chief interest, as usual in the eighteenth century folio, lies in the introduction. Paine had a certain sarcastic humour which redeems him from the prevailing seriousness not always distinguishable from cant, which renders the literary work of most of the eighteenth century architects such exceedingly dry reading. He dispensed with any parade of knowledge on the one hand, and with personal advertisement on the other. He is, in fact, one of the few architects of the eighteenth century who wrote with the unaffected simplicity of a gentleman. His point of view was that of the older school, and the suspicion with which such men as Chambers and Paine regarded the new fashions which followed the publications of "Palmyra" Wood, Robert Adam, and Stuart and Revett, was amply justified by the result. Paine pointed out the danger of copying foreign models under alien conditions and on absurd and impossible scales, but his caution was disregarded, and the consequences speedily followed in the monstrous architecture of Regent's Park.

The new departure was announced in "The Works in Architecture of Robert and James Adam," published by themselves in 1778, and containing views and details of Sion House, Kenwood, Luton House, and various other buildings erected from their designs; and designs for furniture, plate, and upholsterers' fittings, with descriptive letterpress in French and English. The Adams, as I have already pointed

out, considered themselves reformers, and were proud of having "exploded" (to use their own term) the severe masculine manner of their predecessors. Opposite the title-page of their work is a large engraving after Ant. Zucchi, with the inscription: "a student conducted to Minerva who points to Greece and Italy as the countries from whence they must derive the most perfect taste and knowledge in elegant architecture." The design is characteristic of the new movement in its pretentious affectation. The Adams introduced no improvement into English architecture of the slightest value, but they did introduce a great quantity of meaningless ornament, and they set the fashion for cheap reproductions of the antique and introduced a certain insincerity of taste from which the art has by no means recovered. Robert Adam exhibited in an exaggerated form a quality to some extent peculiar to the eighteenth century architects, the quality of intense self-consciousness. In varying degrees these men were all impressed with a sense of the immense magnificence of their own work. Colin Campbell sounded the first note of it early in the century. Fifty years later James Paine, cool-headed as he was, wrote: "the rapid progress of architecture in Great Britain within these last thirty years is perhaps without example in any age or country since the Romans." Then came Adam with his "revolution in this elegant art," and finally, in 1827, when Britton and Pugin published their "Public Buildings of London," Britton wrote in his preface: "the architectural improvements of the present age exceed in extent, number, variety, and taste, those of any former period." We are thus able to arrive at some idea of the slow decay of architecture in England. These self-congratulations, ever increasing in certainty, are so many marks to show the gradual withdrawal of the tide till it reached the complete low water-mark of the first half of the nineteenth century.

MAPPERTON IN DORSETSHIRE.

CHAPTER XIV.

The Trades: Carpentry, Masonry.

The handicrafts, or, to use the old-fashioned term, the trades, that fall within the scope of architecture are so multifarious, that it is impossible in a general history to do more than indicate their main lines of development. Architecture, in regard to the handicrafts, stands by itself. Unlike the other arts, it is the centre and mainspring of a whole family of crafts working together for a total result, which is something much more than that given by any one of them singly. It is essentially architectonic, the master art; and in the earlier days of architecture, when the arts were far less specialized, architecture did, in fact, embrace all the arts, and the line of demarcation between simple building construction and the work of the artist pure hardly existed. The consequence is that in considering the history of architecture in England down to the end of the sixteenth century, one is to a certain extent considering the history of all the arts in this country as well. For, in England, at any rate, architects, painters, and sculptors had not as yet detached themselves from the general body of craftsmen, and no one so far conceived of these arts as forming the upper grade in an arbitrary hierarchy of art. It appears indeed that while the lower classes treated artists rather as skilled artificers, the Court regarded them as all more or less "βάναυσοι," clever servants degraded by an inferior occupation. Men such as Holbein might be treated with due consideration, but the status and training of the man who painted the

frescoes and screens of the great Perpendicular churches of Norfolk and Suffolk was much more akin to that of an ordinary house-painter than to that of the artist-decorator of the present day; and the sculptor who carved the front of the manor house or college was also the mason who built its walls. Another point to be noticed in English handicrafts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is their natural and unconscious development. The changes that occurred came spontaneously, not as the result of fashion or even individual initiative, but as the inevitable consequence of actual circumstance. Architectural methods were largely determined by the physical conditions of the country. Inland transport, except by water, was very difficult for heavy building materials, and the builder was compelled to use whatever came immediately to his hand. The craft of the carpenter in the sixteenth century is a conspicuous instance. Half timber building, though found in almost every part of England, was habitually employed in the great forest districts, such as Essex, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and in Lancashire, Cheshire, the Forest of Dean and the Welsh marches, and the Weald of Kent and Sussex in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; and it continued in use in these districts till for various reasons the material was no longer available.

The same conditions prevailed in masonry. Where good building stone was abundant, it was used as a matter of course, and an unmistakable local tradition gradually drew together, which survived repeated changes of fashion. Here again it is to be noted that when the change did come, it came by gradual and almost imperceptible stages. The transition followed the inevitable course of events, and in its nature was very different from the violent and deliberate supersession of one style by another, characteristic of modern revivalisms. Where, for instance, workmen were imported from another district, they brought with them their own ideas of workmanship, and grafted them on to the tradition of the place where they settled. The Somersetshire masons at Wadham are a case in point. By this means a gradual absorption of individual methods was constantly at work, with the result that, as the country was opened up, distinctively local peculiarities disappeared in a more or less uniform manner, something that it is convenient to classify as a definite style. The history of the development of a national method in English architecture is to a large extent the history of the gradual fusion of local habits and peculiarities into one common custom, a process of long duration, and intimately associated with the social and industrial development of the country. At the point when this fusion was

completed, a period reached in England by about the middle of the eighteenth century, the two elements of architecture, design and execution, were in exact equipoise. Unfortunately, the balance tilted over. The individuality, once so strongly marked in English vernacular architecture, and the chief source of its excellence, had been ground down to uniformity, and there was nothing left to take its place but arbitrary fashion and a merely mechanical method both in execution and in design.

The causes, indeed, which determined the ebb and flow of architecture lay deeper than those which influenced the other arts. Inveterate habit and economical facts had more to do with it than individual motive, and the history of half timber building shows how the development of architecture is controlled in the long run by causes which lie outside the range of art. Strictly speaking, the earlier examples of sixteenth century carpentry are Gothic rather than Renaissance in character. The old methods in use by the excellent carpenters of the fifteenth century were regularly followed, and the gables, the overhanging storeys, the spurs or angle posts, cusping and tracery, and many a detail of ornamentation show that, in spite of the changes that were imminent, the carpenter followed the mediæval tradition as faithfully as his inferior skill in his craft would allow, and few things are more remarkable in the history of English art than the pertinacity of this tradition. The hammer-beam roof, for instance, survived well into the seventeenth century as a common mode of construction. Yet this was the direct legacy of the fifteenth century, and whatever the ornament in which it was dressed, in spite of cherubs' heads and pendants of grotesques, or pilasters and arches and abundant Renaissance motives, its frank construction and multiplicity of detail reveal very clearly its mediæval origin. The vitality of this particular detail is shown in three characteristic examples: the roof of the hall at Hampton Court, of the Middle Temple Hall, and of the library at Lambeth Palace. The hall of Hampton Court was built 1530-32, after Wolsey's fall. The work was now being carried out directly for the king, and whether by accident, or as the result of a deliberate intention to reverse the Cardinal's arrangements, all the workmen employed were Englishmen, including the carver. The construction of the roof is in the ordinary late Perpendicular manner. It is very elaborate, and abounds in tracery, panels, and richly moulded ribs and brackets; and, except for the coarseness of the detail and a certain forced ingenuity of design, this roof might have been constructed

a hundred years earlier. In the carving, however, the Gothic precedent was entirely abandoned, and the carver gave an exceedingly interesting version of Italian detail as seen by English eyes. The great pendants, carved by Richard Ridge, at 3*s.* 4*d.* a piece,[1] are excellent in design and workmanship, and it is noticeable that this very early carving of the English Renaissance, executed while Italian workmen were still in the land and under their immediate influence, caught the spirit of Italian art more nearly than any subsequent work. Yet the inherent conservatism of English thought was tenacious and victorious. Though the carver at Hampton Court proposed to himself an Italian model, he was as much bound by tradition as the man who made the roof, and the naïveté of his method, his failure in grace and suavity, show how far he was from being really penetrated by Italian thought, and for many generations the English craftsman remained at heart an inveterate mediævalist.[2] In the seventeenth century, when the carpenter was left to his own devices and there was no question of carving, as, for instance, in the roofs of some of the college halls at Oxford, he simply repeated the details and construction which had been in use in England for the last two hundred years. So deeply rooted were the old ideas of timber construction, that in technical handbooks published at the end of the seventeenth century the principal rafters of a king-post truss are shown with a spreading foot. Now in timber sawn out of straight balks this would involve great expense and waste of material. The explanation is that this was taken from the old method of following the natural angle of branches and trunk in cutting roof timbers from the tree.



CARVING TO WOOD PANEL, CHRIST CHURCH, HANTS.

The hall of the Middle Temple was built 1562-72. The principals

[1] Mr. Law takes ten as his multiple for estimating the money values of the time of Henry VIII. At this valuation, the cost of each of these pendants would be about 33*s.* 6*d.* in modern money. Either labour must have been very much cheaper then than it is now, or ten is too low a multiple, for I doubt if any competent wood-carver would think of undertaking these pendants at less than £4 or £5 a piece.

[2] The two panels on either side of the entrance to the Chapel at Hampton Court, obviously carved by an Englishman from an Italian suggestion, are another striking instance.

here have double hammer-beams, otherwise the construction follows generally the lines of the Hampton Court roof; but the details are no longer Gothic, the mouldings are ordinary classic of the time, and instead of the cusping and tracery to the spandrels, there are small turned columns, and above the collar-beam these columns have pedestals. This roof is probably purely English work and by a different hand to the screen.

The roof of the Great Hall at Lambeth is a most interesting throw-back to the original type. The date is just a hundred years later than the Middle Temple roof, yet it deliberately reverted to Gothic detail. The old hall, built by Chichele was destroyed by Scott the Parliamentarian in 1648. On the Restoration, Archbishop Juxon decided to rebuild the Hall, and Aubrey relates that, in spite of the persuasions of his friends, he insisted on its being rebuilt as closely as might be on the original lines. The principals have an upper and lower collar-beam, and beneath the lower collar comes the hammer-beam and post with a great semicircular rib carried right across from corbel to corbel under the lower collar. Supplementary pieces framed into the soffit of this rib form a huge trefoil cusp, the spandrels are filled in with upright posts with cusped heads, and the braces under the purlins have tracery in the spandrel. Curiously enough, the panelling to walls and door frames is ordinary classic of the Restoration, while the roof is Gothic, so that it seems as if Juxon's directions had less to do with it than the idiosyncracies of the carpenter who constructed the roof, and the joiner who made the panelling. The mediæval tradition survived in construction long after it had died out in ornamental detail.



A SPUR, SMARDEN, KENT.

The spur or angle post of the half timber houses of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries shows the same instinctive conservatism. This was a familiar feature in mediæval domestic architecture, and there are still a few instances left, as at King's Lynn, Bury St. Edmunds and Shrewsbury, and the beautiful example at Lavenham in Suffolk, to show the extreme care lavished on its ornament. As a method of construction, the spur, with its accompanying system of floor framing, continued in use till the time of Charles I., and by constant experience



HALF TIMBER HOUSE, ROLVENDEN, KENT. EARLY SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

of its practical purpose the sixteenth century carpenter was able to give it a form which was not only more efficient, but more beautiful in shape than the elaborate mediæval angle post. Instead of a square balk bending outwards he shaped the upper part into a complex curve, which does not occur elsewhere, and is, I believe, peculiar to English half timber work of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—instances are common in the admirable half timber buildings of the Weald of Kent and Sussex.[1] But with this modification the spur remained essentially Gothic, and, with the construction of which it formed a part, continued

[1] The finest examples of half timber building in Lancashire are Baguley, Morton Old Hall, Speke Hall, Smithells, and Agecroft. Stanley Palace or Derby House, in the Watergate, Chester, dated 1591, is a good late sixteenth century example; other instances will

in use until for other reasons half timber construction was generally abandoned. The actual reasons which led to the disuse of half timber building had nothing to do with architecture. In the Weald, for example, attention was called to the gradual diminution of the timber supply as early as the reign of Edward VI. In 1549[1] the Mayor of Rye reported to Somerset on the scarcity of timber occasioned by the iron mills; and in 1573-74[2] Christopher Baker made a report on the great consumption of oak wood in Sussex, Kent, and Surrey by the iron mills and furnaces, and returned a list of all furnaces and owners in the three counties. Serious alarm was felt as to the supply of timber available for ship building, and oak timber ceased to be a cheap and convenient building material. The result was that half timber building fell out of use about the time it had reached its full maturity. The disappearance of half timber building in the middle and west of England at about the same date was partly due to a similar cause. Camden mentions



HOUSE AT SISSINGHURST, KENT. SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

be found in Taylor's "Old Halls in Lancashire and Cheshire." The Gate House of the Council House at Shrewsbury, date 1620, is characteristic of west country work in its richness of detail. The houses in the Weald of Kent are smaller in scale, but more refined in design than those of the west country, and most of them date from the early part of the seventeenth rather than from the sixteenth century. Good examples are to be found at Headcorn (fifteenth century), Singleton and Beavor, near Ashford (sixteenth century), Lenham, Biddenden, and Cranbrook (seventeenth century). The example in the text exists at Rolvenden in Kent.

[1] Cal. State Papers, Domestic, Ed. VI., vol. vii., May 27, 1549.

[2] Cal. State Papers, Domestic, vol. xcv., Feb. 15, 1574.

that the Forest of Dean, which was almost impenetrable in the reign of Henry VI., was in his time very much thinned, owing to the discovery of the rich veins of iron in the forest. In Essex, by the middle of the seventeenth century, a large part of the county had been disforested and reclaimed as arable land.

The change of style, the abandonment of Gothic that is, came first in details, and did not extend to construction till the middle of the seventeenth century. The hall of Exeter College, Oxford, is an instructive example. The open timbered roof and the oak screen are both of the same date, about 1624; the roof, an integral part of the building, would have done no discredit to a fifteenth century carpenter, but the screen, which was considered almost as an affair of furniture, is a deliberate and fairly successful attempt at Renaissance design, rude in execution, but typical of Jacobean woodwork in the freedom and vigour of its ornament. In both cases there can be little doubt that the carpenter who did the work supplied the design according to his own fancy, and that Acland, at whose expense the hall was built, probably went to one man for his roof and another for his screen.

From ornamental detail the change spread to actual construction. Sir Paul Pindar's house, which used to stand in Bishopsgate Street,[1] marks the point of transition. The front of this house, built early in the seventeenth century, was, in fact, one immense bay window in two storeys, with cartouches carved in panels below the sills, and might have been transplanted wholesale from an ordinary Elizabethan house. The form of the bay was such as had been in use in England since the beginning of the sixteenth century, and the ornamentation was rather coarse Jacobean. Sparrow's house at Ipswich, a most remarkable example of timber construction freely decorated with plaster work, carries the development a stage further.[2] The first floor overhangs the ground floor considerably, and is supported by a series of elaborate balusters with carved brackets and swags on the frieze between. On either side of the bay windows on the first floor are pilasters on pedestals; these, however, are merely surface decoration, and play no part in the construction. They run out into the flat soffit of a great projecting cornice, which is carried along the entire front and sides with shallow returns

[1] The front is now in the South Kensington Museum.

[2] The date given for this house, 1567, occurs on some panelling in a room on the ground floor. The exterior, however, and the ceiling to the long room on the first floor, are evidently later, and date from the middle of the seventeenth century, when the house came into the possession of the Sparrows, after whom it is named.

above the centre of the bays. The level lines and broad, deep shadows of this building, show that the designer was getting away from Gothic



SPARROW'S HOUSE, IPSWICH,

architecture, and beginning to realize the constructional possibilities of Classic; and the next step forward was to use columns and entablatures with full consciousness of their intention, as in the colonnade to the

courtyard at Knole. After the middle of the seventeenth century timber buildings were constructed as frankly neo-classical in design as any contemporary masonry or brickwork. Not only in the profiles and mouldings, and the use of columns and lintels for their legimate constructive purpose, but in a general horizontality of treatment, these buildings show that the carpenter had at length assimilated the new ideas, and had got beyond the stage of merely plastering classical details on Gothic construction, characteristic of Elizabethan and Jacobean



COLONNADE, KNOLE.

architecture. The course of development is indicated by some of the town halls of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The Market Hall of Ledbury consists of a ground floor open on all sides, and an upper floor inclosed with oak studs and plaster work. It is a perfectly plain building of timber, with practically no ornament: such mouldings as remain suggest that it was built between 1500 and 1550;[1] and, in so far as it has any distinctive character, it is a good example of vernacular

[1] In 1584 Elizabeth renewed the market charter of the town, and granted a weekly market and annual fairs. In spite of the early character of the details, it is quite possible that in a remote place such as Ledbury, 1584 is the date of the building.

Gothic carpentry. The beautiful Guildhall of Lavenham in Suffolk, which dates from about the same period, is the counterpart of this building. In its richness of ornament and precision of workmanship, characteristic of the architecture of the eastern counties, it shows the extreme point of refinement attained by mediæval carpentry, followed almost immediately by that remarkable drop or hiatus in the development of English art, the first evidence of which appears in the reign of Elizabeth, and which is perhaps to be accounted for by the withdrawal of the Italian artist and the complete severance from Italian models. Early in the seventeenth century Abel designed and built the Town Hall of Leominster, already referred to. The general idea of this building, both in plan and general construction, followed closely the Ledbury precedent, but Abel introduced a great quantity of rude ornamental detail, based, so far as his knowledge would permit, on Renaissance motives. But this was merely the beginning of the change, its full intention was not yet assimilated, and the organic alteration of the style was not completed till the latter part of the seventeenth century, when, as in such instances as the Guildford Town Hall, or No. 413 and 415 in the Strand, both construction and ornament were designed together. The designer was now capable of more than mere haphazard phrases borrowed from another language, he thought in terms of neo-classical architecture; after long years of experiment he had worked out a coherent and flexible style for the expression of his ideas. For various reasons, such as the scarcity of timber and the increased attention paid to building regulations in the large towns, it was at this very period that half timber architecture disappeared; few buildings of any importance were constructed of timber after the end of the seventeenth century. The carpenter-architect, who designed and executed his own work, had ceased to exist, architects had detached themselves from craftsmanship, and the result was that, though the tradition of good workmanship was carried on into the eighteenth century, the work of the carpenter was specialized and limited to constructive details, and the joiner and the wood-carver divided between them all the work that required exact skill of handicraft. It is almost certain that Abel in Herefordshire, Holt at Oxford, and Woodroffe at Cambridge, designed as well as executed their roofs and screens with all their ornament; but later in the seventeenth century we find Austin undertaking joiner's work only, and Grinling Gibbons and his school employed solely for the carving. The result was an immense advance in technical skill and accomplishment, but the worst of all specialization



MARKET HALL, LEDBURY.

is that it narrows the outlook of the specialist; the inevitable tendency is to concentrate attention on one special branch of workmanship, without regard to the large effect of the whole; and though the joiners of the end of the eighteenth century were fully equal in technical skill to the men who worked under Wren, their work has lost the large architectural quality shown by the earlier men. It became thin and wiry, a fault not solely due to the general decadence of architecture, but probably inseparable from this excessive specialization. A comparison of any staircase executed in the last thirty years of the eighteenth century with the fine bold detail of a hundred years earlier will show the extent of this degeneration, and much the same changes are to be found in other details of woodwork, such as panelling. Starting in the sixteenth century with Gothic motives, such as the linen panel and the like, panelling passed through the stages of the small and delicately moulded oblongs of the time of Elizabeth and James I. to the bold simple panels of Inigo Jones and Wren. In their hands the whole treatment of decorative woodwork was altered; the chief excellence of Jacobean panelling had been the refinement of its details and its surface quality; it took the place of tapestry, and, as a means of artistic effect, might almost be considered as interchangeable with wall hangings. It might or might not be richly carved, but its intention in any case was to give a uniform and continuous background. The larger panelling of Inigo Jones and Wren was designed from an altogether different standpoint: its disposition of lines formed part of the architectural composition, it had to be considered with reference to the same standards of architecture as the rest of the building, and in this regard required a sense of proportion and a power of selection and reserve undreamt of by the Jacobean designers. The admirable panelling in Wren's buildings at Hampton Court, and in the staircase of Ashburnham House, show how greatly panelling had gained in breadth and distinction of style by the end of the seventeenth century, and this high standard of attainment was well maintained in the earlier half of the eighteenth century; but when designers began to refine upon earlier work, they discarded panelling for stucco ornament, and the details of their joinery became petty and insignificant. The sense of woodwork as woodwork capable of effects peculiar to itself was forgotten—as with the other crafts of architecture by the end of the eighteenth century architects had lost their touch of material.

The physical conditions which influenced the craft of carpentry were at work in the handicraft of masonry in an intenser form. The



CUPOLA TO HOSPITAL FOR DECAYED FISHERMEN, GREAT YARMOUTH (1702).

oak or chestnut of one district in England does not vary to any appreciable extent from that of another, but there is the widest possible difference in its building stones, not only in their strength and ease, or difficulty of working, but in the sizes attainable and the texture and surface which they are capable of receiving. Style and material react on each other in masonry to a remarkable degree. For instance, a correct Palladian design requires stones dressed to a particular shape and size, and the effect depends partly on the accurate proportion of the individual stones as set out on his drawing by the architect. Now it would be impossible to carry this out in a laminated stone, which runs in lengths varying in thickness, but never exceeding a few inches in depth. It can only be properly executed in a freestone admitting of blocks of any practicable size, such as Bath or Portland stone, and this fact accounts for the almost universal employment of Portland stone in important buildings of the time of Wren, and of Bath stone in the century following. Where, on the other hand, only thin-layered stone was obtainable, the builder was forced to abandon the orthodox manner, and to follow approximately the old tradition of gables and rough coursed walling, such as s common in Oxfordshire, and so great is the influence of material on design in masonry that, in districts such as Oxfordshire, the tradition of the seventeenth century can still be traced in common buildings erected within the last fifty years. Mr. Gotch says of Northamptonshire: "Quite into the eighteenth century we find in small buildings the same forms that prevailed at the end of the sixteenth century," and even in the mill architecture of the Yorkshire manufacturing towns, harsh and forbidding as it is, there remained a certain local quality and some of the dignity of the eighteenth century in buildings erected as late as 1840. Local peculiarities, in fact, are



ENTRANCE TO CORSHAM COURT.



Face p. 334.

CLOCK CASE AND "QUARTER-BOYS," RYE CHURCH, SUSSEX.



HOUSE AT BURWASH, SUSSEX (1699).

more strongly marked in masonry than in any other trade. There is no mistaking vernacular work of the seventeenth century in the North: with its long, low windows, massive mullions, often unpleasantly close together, its rudimentary ornament, and extreme solidity of construction. Partly this was due to the difficulties of working the hard Yorkshire stone, partly to the necessities of a severe climate, partly perhaps to the limited nature of the northerner, somewhat insensible to refined design, but keenly alive to actual facts. Contrast this with contemporary work in the south of England and the difference of temperament and conditions is evident. The mullions do not crowd upon each other as in the north country windows, the roofs of tiles or small stone slates are steeper, and the gables more fanciful because their form was not determined by any such obstinate materials as the great flagstone roof-coverings of Yorkshire.[1] Altogether the impression left is that of a freer and more genial life, of conditions in which there was room for some kindlier play of humour, some regard to the grace of life beyond the strict necessities of existence. In this vernacular work, work, that is, which grew naturally out of local conditions and was not dictated by imported design, one always finds the same three elements at work: local materials, local conditions of climate, and individual temperament; and some curious instances of this are to be found in out-of-the-way parts of England, as, for instance, in the singular gateway



PART OF WALL AT AMESBURY, WILTS.

[1] The determination of form by material is shown clearly in the roofs covered with Horsham slates. These were obtained in large sizes, and the pitch of the roof in consequence was comparatively flat, as in Yorkshire.

of Lanhydrock in Cornwall (1650), in which the details are outside classification, and appear to result from the use of granite and the working of a somewhat backward intelligence. The squared work of flint and stone, such as is found in the Guildhall at King's Lynn, or again at Amesbury, Longford Castle, Stockton, Lake House and elsewhere in Wiltshire, or in East Kent, is another example of work entirely dictated by the actual materials to hand. Nor was this natural growth of style in masonry by any means confined to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In the eighteenth century great



GATEHOUSE, SANDWICH.

stone districts, such as that of Bath, developed their own particular traditions; at Bradford-on-Avon and in the neighbourhood may be found details almost peculiar to this part of England, and derived not from the deliberate designs of architects, but from the more or less unconscious initiative of local masons. I give an instance of a door-head from Corsham; simple as it is, this is not based on any precedent, but is clearly the result of this process of natural development which I have endeavoured to suggest, and though it is useless to speculate on what might have been, it is a matter for regret that in these and other details where a strong local tradition prevailed, builders should have abandoned it in favour of prevailing fashions of detail which they

probably misunderstood, and certainly habitually misapplied. This fact is very clearly seen in modern buildings in Yorkshire, where the less important stone buildings in the towns have every fault which it is possible to combine in a design, whereas the farm buildings erected far away on the moors, with no idea beyond that of providing shelter against the wind and rain, still adhere to the old traditions, and have a very distinct and impressive individuality.

It is, in fact, to these humbler buildings, cottages, farms, farm buildings and the like, that one has to look in order to trace the permanent building tradition of the country. Individually they are unimportant, but considered together, they acquire a distinct significance, forming as it were a background to the more conscious architecture of trained designers, and giving it colour not only through the peculiarities of local methods of workmanship, but also through the influence they inevitably exercise on the minds of any but the most arbitrary or least observant of architects. This influence is very much weaker now than it was 300 years ago. In proportion as architecture became more exact, that is, more a matter of knowledge and training than of strong individual impulse, the architect detached himself from the builder, and neglected the admirable groundwork of ideas to be found in his own country in favour of foreign motives. And it is to this fatal severance of architecture from building that we owe the uninterrupted succession of revivalisms of the last hundred years. Architects have, in fact, deliberately debarred themselves from the most certain means of attaining style, that is, of placing themselves in touch with all that is of permanent value in architecture, by substituting the crudest expression of their own individuality for the assured



STONE DOORHEAD, CORSHAM.

tradition which results from the persistent tendency of generations, and in more recent years by suppressing even their own individuality in favour of direct and literal copy. These considerations, however, apply to some of the Elizabethan designers not less fully than to architects of the nineteenth century. I have already pointed out how the first introduction of the Renaissance in England was limited exclusively to ornamental detail, with results which, so far as they went, were charming. But the men who designed for the great noblemen of the time of Elizabeth and James I.—possibly the great noblemen themselves—were too vainglorious of their recent knowledge to rest content with this. They piled order above order, and entablature above entablature, without the least regard to the tradition of their own country, or with any understanding of the art of the great masters whom they copied. The consequence is, that the most ambitious of these palaces, such as Audley End and Wollaton, are the worst pieces of architecture to be found in England during the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. Contrast these with such buildings as Blickling and Burton Agnes, or Littlecote, Wakehurst, and parts of Knole, and the value of the traditional method is evident.

For good or for bad, however, this method was continually losing ground and the foreign fashion taking its place. Fortunately for the future of English architecture the new departure was taken up by Inigo Jones, and he, with the instinct for simplicity and hatred of disorder inherent in genius, swept away this redundant ornament and confusion of motives. He was the first to introduce the single order on a rusticated basement,[1] such as is used in the houses on the west side of Lincoln's Inn Fields, and instead of playing with entablatures, used them with serious regard to their original functions. He designed in fact in neo-classic instead of merely applying neo-classic ornament to another design. As the result of this radical innovation a change speedily followed in details. The stone mullions and transomes disappeared soon after the middle of the seventeenth century, lingering on in conservative places such as Oxford, as, for instance, at the Ashmolean, and the oblong window took its place, glazed at first with casements, wooden mullions and transomes. These were superseded by the sash window early in the reign of William III., and in the earliest instances the sash bars reproduce the mouldings of the old mullions and are almost thick enough to carry a casement. This change in fenestration

[1] An attempt at a larger treatment of the orders had been made at Kirby, but though bold and picturesque it is merely rudimentary in design. (See below.)

is the final sign of the abandonment of the earlier phases of the Renaissance. The history of Kirby in Northamptonshire is a characteristic example. The original house was built 1570-75 on a quadrangular plan. On the north and south sides are the pilasters already referred to, running through from the ground floor to the entablature above the first floor windows, and the original windows had stone mullions and transomes. In 1638-40 the owner appears to have been dissatisfied with these windows, and employed Inigo Jones to design fresh windows, balconies over the archways on the north and south sides, and certain internal fittings to the hall. These new windows are oblong, with architrave mouldings and plain pilasters with brackets supporting pediments, which are alternately triangular and segmental. A broken pediment with a pedestal for a bust surmounts the opening to the balconies. The windows were glazed with lead lights with iron casement frames. No more characteristic object lesson exists in England of the difference between the old manner and the new. The older building, picturesque and vigorous, was designed and executed by men who had either seen Italian work or, as is more probable, had casts of Italian examples to copy. Mr. Gotch points out that the carving to the frieze at the first floor level was not designed for its position, but cuts up as it comes wherever it meets a projection, and the entablature has no sort of relation in scale to the great pilasters; altogether this earlier work suggests the exuberance of men who were delighted with a new fashion, seen for the first time, and handled with no previous knowledge and scanty artistic training—masons' work in every sense of the word. Both in design and execution it is far below the masterly detail of Inigo Jones, which is austerely reticent, and depends for its effect on purity of line and proportion, and perfect precision of technique. If the latter had lost the playfulness of the mason's design it had gained immeasurably in the qualities of great and dignified architecture, qualities which are surely the ideal to be aimed at in modern design. One may regret the romance and abandon of the earlier work, but it is an affectation and an anachronism to reproduce its half-developed art.

With the mullioned window also disappeared the strapwork parapet, as at Hardwick, and the succession of small entablatures with which the Jacobean builders divided up the different storeys. The diminutive mouldings of these orders, often correct as far as they went in scale and profile, but ridiculously out of scale with the buildings as a whole, were superseded by bold entablatures proportionate to the



THE TOWN HALL, ABINGDON.

increased dimensions given to the column. A certain impatience with the pettiness of Jacobean work, with what Evelyn called "our busie and Gotic triflings in the compositions of the five orders," seems to have become general before the middle of the seventeenth century, and so long as this feeling was guided by master minds, such as Inigo Jones and Wren, its influence on English architecture was entirely good, and it succeeded in restoring to it something of the reasonableness of the older tradition. For the first time since the building of the chapel at King's, architecture in the great manner, work, that is, which was impressive not merely by its size, but by the distribution of its masses, was again carried out in England, and the mason himself, if no longer allowed to design as in the days of Symons and Wigg, gained in technical skill by being limited to the actual handiwork of masonry. When Wren began to practise there were already to his hand masons trained under the severe discipline of Inigo Jones, who were capable of executing classical detail with exact knowledge; and under the influence of Wren and his successors, there grew up in England a school of masons of unrivalled skill, men such as the Strongs who built St. Paul's, who were capable of dealing with the most difficult problems of stone-cutting with absolute mastery. And, indeed, the architects of the early part of the eighteenth century were by no means sparing in their demands on their masons. Wren, who was essentially sane, could show his men the way out of any difficulty; but towards the end of the seventeenth century a sort of megalomania seems to have set in. Neither Vanbrugh nor Hawksmoor could ever get their orders big enough to please themselves, and he could have been no apprentice who carried out the monstrous masonry of Blenheim, or the huge order of the old Clarendon Press, in which the diameter of the columns to the portico is 3 ft. 10 in.; or of the Christ Church Library where Clarke, with the ambition of the amateur to break the record, made his Corinthian columns 4 ft. in diameter. Only very skilful masons could execute these grandiose designs without risk of failure. Their expense and difficulty probably led to their abandonment, and the order gradually shrank in its dimensions till it dwindled to the flat strips of pilasters used by Adam. Meanwhile, architects had introduced all sorts of variations into the orders. Adam altered the entasis and designed new capitals to the columns. The older pattern books became obsolete, and the new fashion for Greek architecture towards the end of the eighteenth century completed the bewilderment of the mason, and at length obliterated the fine traditional



DETAIL TO HOUSE IN WEST STREET, CHICHESTER.

sense of classical detail once possessed by any well-trained mason in England.

Thus the mason had lost the knowledge of his craft and come to be entirely dependent on the directions of architects; and the mason-architect of the seventeenth century had finally disappeared. Grumbold at Cambridge was one of the last. His father, Thomas Grumbold, who was paid as a working mason in 1638-39, supplied a draught of Clare Bridge for which he received 3*s.*; and in 1669 Robert Grumbold, the son, Freemason, was employed to design and carry out the beautiful river buildings at Clare. In 1685 he was being paid at the rate of 20*s.* a week for his designs and his work as master mason, the college finding all materials; and about the same time he appears to have designed the west front of St. Katherine's, Cambridge. Little is known about Grumbold except that he was both mason and architect, but there must have been other men of the same stamp at work in England till the middle of the eighteenth century. In 1714 the Corporation of Great Yarmouth decided to build the Chapel of Ease of St. George. A committee of local gentry was appointed, and the work was contracted for by a builder of the town named Price;[1] no architect was employed,—the design was made by Price, and it is evident that the committee had nothing to do with it, for it was proposed that the Church of St. Clement Danes should be taken as a model, to which building



DOORWAY AT CLARE, BY R. GRUMBOLD.

[1] Palmer's "Perlustration of Great Yarmouth," ii. 195.

Wilson, Aberdeen, Phots.

Face p. 344.

CLARE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.



ST. GEORGE'S, GREAT YARMOUTH.

the Chapel of St. George bears not the slightest resemblance. It is built of fine red bricks with stone dressings, now covered with paint, and at the west end is a picturesque tower with an open belfry over



TOWN HALL, WALLINGFORD.

it in two stages, surmounted by a cupola and an open ironwork vane. In so far as Price imitated any building, his design was inspired by the late seventeenth century towers of some of the Dutch town halls. There are certain technical defects in some of the details, but with this exception the work is not inferior to what was being done by

professional architects at the time. The charming little Hospital for Decayed Fishermen, built by the Corporation of Great Yarmouth in 1702, is another example. The name of the designer of such an admirable building as the Town Hall at Abingdon (1677) is unknown. The skill and knowledge displayed make it improbable that this was designed by a mason only, yet there are other buildings, such as the Town Hall of Wallingford, of a simpler character, but hardly less excellent, which were quite within the competence of any good builder of the time. It seems likely, indeed, that in places far away from the big towns, we ought to look to the local builder (mason or carpenter) rather than to any architect as the designer of buildings, by no means the least charming or important among the remains of English eighteenth century architecture, and for the last trace of that traditional skill which enabled the mason of the seventeenth century to carve his stones as well as to lay them, one must search among the headstones of village churchyards. Something of the playfulness and poetry of the Elizabethans still lingered in the country, and while Artari and Bagutti were modelling conventionalities in stucco for Gibbs, the stone-mason at Dorchester was cutting on his tombstones the mallows and forget-me-nots of the meadows round his home.

A TOMBSTONE, DORCHESTER.

CHAPTER XV.

Brickwork, Plaster Work, Lead, and Iron.

The re-introduction of brickwork into England was probably due to two causes, first, to the scarcity of building stones in the neighbourhood, and secondly, to the large immigration of Flemings into the eastern counties. The inhabitants of the Netherlands had long been skilful in the use of brickwork. Their country was destitute of stone, and brick was, in fact, almost the only building material available. Much the same conditions prevailed in the eastern counties. The fact that it was in Norfolk and Suffolk that brickwork was first used again since the date of the Roman occupation, that these were the counties which received the earliest Flemish settlements, and that the dates of these settlements and of the re-introduction of brickwork almost coincide, make it probable that we owe the revived use of brickwork to the Flemish immigrants, and that in the earliest instances the bricks themselves were imported from the Netherlands.

As early as the reign of Edward I., Flemish wool manufacturers and weavers settled at Worstead in Norfolk. Further settlements of Flemings were made at Hadleigh and Sudbury in the reign of Edward III. After that reign they became common throughout the eastern counties, and wherever the Flemings settled distinct traces of their influence are found in the brickwork of the neighbourhood. The earliest instance of the use of brickwork since the Roman occupation is said to be Little Wenham Hall in Suffolk, supposed to have been built about 1260. These bricks were probably imported.[1] The north-east angle tower of Faulkbourn Hall, near Witham, is said to date from the early part of the fifteenth century, and the north and east ranges of Queen's College, Cambridge, were built in 1448. The bricks at Queen's vary in size from 8 in. by 2 in. by $4\frac{1}{4}$ in. to 8 in. by $1\frac{3}{4}$ in. by 4 in. They are burnt extremely hard to a dark purple red, as in the older work at Hampton Court, and in some cases the headers have vitrified yellow

[1] The bricks used in the Norman keep at Colchester are said to be Roman bricks used again.

ends. They are very irregular in shape, but as hard as the hardest tile. The joints are wide, and the brickwork measures 11½ in. from centre to



BRICKWORK AND TERRA-COTTA, GREAT SNORING RECTORY, NORFOLK.

centre of four courses. Caister Castle, near Great Yarmouth, built by Sir John Fastolf, and afterwards held by the Pastons, is of much the

same date as Queen's, and is built entirely of brick. Some thirty years later Oxburgh Hall, near Swaffham, was built by Sir. Edward Bedingfield in 1482-83. It was originally a quadrangular house, with a crenellated and machicolated gateway 80 ft. high, all in brickwork. The gateway and the main buildings of the splendid ruin of Hurstmonceux, in Sussex, are of much the same date as Oxburgh, perhaps a little earlier. Stone is used in this very sparingly for the dressings, and the walls are built of fine red bricks, measuring about 9¼ in. by 2 in. by 4½ in., and about 10½ in. centre to centre of four courses. Great Cressingham Priory, not far from Oxburgh Hall, a remarkable instance of brick moulded panel work, was built in 1513, a little earlier than Wolsey's work at Hampton Court. The brick and terra-cotta work of East Barsham Manor House and of Great Snoring Rectory[1] has been already referred to in Chapter I. Both of these houses, which date from the early part of the sixteenth century, are richly ornamented with tracery and panels, and terra-cotta ornament. Their style is late Perpendicular, with distinct traces here and there of Italian ornament. In brickwork, as in carpentry and masonry, the transition to Renaissance art crept in by slow degrees in detail. Constructional features, gables, chimney-stacks, angle-turrets, and gateways preserved the mediæval manner long after it had been abandoned in the details of their ornament, and in the earlier instances one usually finds that some exceptional influence was present to account for the introduction of foreign motives. Sir Richard Weston, for instance, the builder of Sutton Place, was a distinguished servant of Henry VIII.; so, too, at Layer Marney and the Vyne. In all these cases the owners were men who had travelled much, and had seen something of the beautiful work then being done abroad, and there can be little doubt that the new fashion in ornament was introduced by their direction rather than on the initiative of the actual workmen. The presence of foreign artists in England rendered such a departure possible. Terra-cotta was only used with any freedom so long as the Italians were present in England. It never took its place as one of the building materials of the country.

The influence of the Flemings was by no means confined to Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex. Large immigrations of Flemish artizans occurred in east Kent in the sixteenth century, and the earliest example

[1] Pugin, who made a measured drawing of East Barsham, calls it Wolterton Manor House. Drawings of it are also to be found in Britton's "Architectural Antiquities," vol. ii., "Vetusta Monumenta," vol. iv., and "Some Old Halls and Manor Houses in the County of Norfolk," by E. Willins.

of brickwork in this part of England besides Hurstmonceux, is probably the little brick chapel of Small Hythe near Tenterden, which has the corbie steps to the gables common throughout the eastern counties, and almost certainly Flemish in its origin, and good simple brick tracery to the windows such as is commonly found in Holland. This chapel was probably built early in the reign of Henry VIII. Another example is to be found in East Street, Rye, a house built of small yellow bricks, varying in colour from light yellow to pink, resembling what are now called Dutch clinkers, and almost certainly imported from Holland.[1] Exactly similar bricks, baked out of river mud, are to be found at Dort, Gouda, and other towns of Holland. They are also found in the interior of Camber Castle, one of the castles built by Henry VIII. to defend the entrance to the old harbour at Rye. A few examples are to be found at Sandwich, and one very remarkable instance in Delf Street which reproduces exactly the Dutch house of the sixteenth century, and was no doubt built by one of the Walloon silk weavers settled in Sandwich. This house has stone quoins at the angles, and the walling consists of alternate bands of stone, black knapped flints and small yellow bricks. The window openings have elliptical arched heads, all flush, the soffits shaped as large cusps and built of alternate voussoirs of small red and yellow bricks. The Dutch original is reproduced in the rich iron wall ties and the large detached iron letters giving the date 1616 with a monogram W. O. in the centre. This, though a late example, is very characteristic of the Flemish manner as adapted to English materials.

[1] These bricks vary in size, some measuring only 6 in. by 3 in. by 1½ in.; others (but these are probably about fifty years later) measure 8 in. by 4 in. by 2 in. In Emmanuel College, Cambridge, the bricks used by Symons in 1586 measure 9¼ in. by 2¼ in. by 4½ in. The bricks to Jesus College gateway, Cambridge (late fifteenth century), are 8¾ in. by 1¾ in. by 4½ in., 11 in. centre to centre of joints, which are nearly 1 in. thick and formed of very hard mortar. The brickwork to this gateway is very rough. No attempt was made to keep the courses horizontal or to preserve the perpends. The entrance towers to the gateway of St. John's, which are of about the same date, are built of dark red bricks 8¼ in. by 2¼ in. by 4½ in., and measure 11½ in. centre to centre of four courses. The pointing is very dark, but differs from modern black pointing in having a rough gritty surface. A diaper is formed in this brickwork with vitrified bricks, and on the side to the quadrangle small yellow and pink bricks are introduced, similar to those described in the text. The chief characteristic of this sixteenth century brickwork is its extremely casual method of execution. The joints are very large and usually formed with very good mortar, but the workman was evidently quite indifferent to that mechanical finish so dear to the heart of the modern bricklayer. After two or three hundred years of wear the old rough surface has a very much finer quality than the careful pointing of later work, but it is not easy to imagine its effect when first executed.

By the middle of the sixteenth century brickwork was fairly established in England as an important building material. It took the place of stone where the latter was scarce, or was used to form the walls, the stonework being reserved for strings and dressings and ornaments, as at Hatfield, Blickling, Bramshill, Shaw House, and elsewhere. Though employed at first in conjunction with half timber buildings, as in parts of Windsor Castle, for filling up between the studs, it gradually superseded timber construction, and by the time of Charles I. became the principal building material for the home and eastern counties. Its history in this regard has been rather curious. Throughout the reign of Henry VIII. brickwork was freely employed not only for plain building but also for ornamental work. Moulded panels, tracery, and cusping, were executed in brickwork and terra-cotta; but from the middle of the sixteenth to the middle of the seventeenth century its use for ornamental purposes seems to have been practically abandoned, and it does not seem to have occurred to English builders to employ it for moulded strings, pilasters, cornices, and other details, till the middle of the seventeenth century. Brick mullions, elliptical window heads, and labels are found in Elizabethan and Jacobean buildings, as, for instance, in the almshouses at Audley End, and moulded brick copings to gables are common; but ornamental details were nearly always executed in stonework throughout this period.

The development of design in brickwork is seen most clearly in the treatment of chimneys and gables. Throughout the eastern counties the corbie step gable was commonly used in the sixteenth century. Instances are found in Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex. There is a gateway at Sandwich, dated, with a gable of this description, and another, now used as the entrance to a brewery, in St. Dunstan's Street, Canterbury. These are evidently inspired by Flemish examples, as is the characteristic bonding employed for the rake of plain gables in buildings of this date in the eastern counties. At the beginning of the seventeenth century the stepped gable seems to have been gradually superseded by gables formed of segments of a circle, as, for instance, the gables of the river front of St. John's, Cambridge. These latter are frequently found in seventeenth century houses in the Isle of Thanet, throughout east Kent, in Norfolk and Suffolk, and elsewhere in England, and may have been suggested by the stone gables of the Jacobean house, but it is more probable that they were suggested by the gables of the Netherlands. Mr. Gotch gives a characteristic example at Bourne Pond, near Colchester, dated 1591, which exactly resembles some of the gable ends



ENTRANCE TO STABLES, CALE HILL, KENT.

of the north of Holland. Brick gables continued in use till the gable treatment was superseded by cornices of moulded brick, wood, or stone at the end of the seventeenth century.

Chimney-stacks did not come into common use before the time of Henry VIII. Of course chimneys are found in castles and in important buildings of a very much earlier date; but as late as the middle of the sixteenth century it was still the custom in many a yeoman's house to let the smoke of the hall escape through a louvre in the roof. The change can be followed closely in the half timber houses of the Weald of Kent. In these houses, built on a flat H plan, the centre was occupied by the common living room, open to the roof. About 1550 or thereabouts, for the date can only be arrived at approximately from an examination of the mouldings, a floor was inserted some seven to nine feet above the ground floor, and the hall converted into a ground and first floor, the old cambered tie-beams and octagonal king-posts still remaining above the first floor. There are examples of this to be found at Dixter, near Northiam in Sussex, Willesley at Cranbrook, and at houses in Headcorn, and Lamberhurst in Kent. At the time this conversion was carried out, the chimney-stack was built, and it usually consisted of an immense opening on the ground floor, varying in size from about 4 ft. by 8 ft. in smaller instances to 5 or 6 ft. by 14 ft. in larger, usually with one or more windows in the outer wall of the stack, and with a cambered oak beam to act as a lintol in the side of the room. This formed the ingle-nook. The owner sat inside it, and bacon and hams were smoked in the huge cavity above, which ran straight up, gradually diminishing till it reached the open air. The whole was admirably picturesque, but better adapted for down draughts and for smoking bacon than for the purposes of a chimney. The upper part of the chimney-stack was either carried up square, or if, as was the case in houses of a better class, several flues were taken up together, the flues at the top were built as octagonal shafts, often enriched with moulded caps and bases, as at East Barsham and the older chimneys at Hampton Court, or the shafts were set diagonally on the rectangular base, as at Mapledurham. Probably to counteract the down draughts of this unscientific flue, these chimney-stacks were usually carried up to a considerable height above the roof. This form of chimney-stack continued in common use till the beginning of the seventeenth century. It was gradually found, however, that flues help each other by being brought into close contact, and that the great size of the older flues was unnecessary; and by the middle of the seventeenth century chimney-stacks had



CHIMNEY STACK, EAST BARSHAM, NORFOLK.

developed into the form which they have practically retained ever since, namely, a compact rectangular stack. The flue was made smaller, and the size of chimney openings was gradually reduced, till they dwindled down to the exiguous dimensions induced by the modern grate. Instead of detached or semi-detached octagonal shafts, the sides of the upper part of the flue, if ornamented at all, had moulded panels of rubbed brick, or a recessed panel with semicircular head and a simple moulded entablature at the top. There is a good simple example at Burwash in Sussex, dated 1699. In the following century, and after Wren's influence had been superseded by the fashion for rigid Palladianism, the chimney-stack was neglected. In fact, by the middle of the eighteenth century architects had ceased to consider the chimney-stack as an essential feature of the elevation. They dealt with it rather as a necessary evil, to be kept in the background as much as possible.

About the middle of the seventeenth century what is called "rubbed brickwork," that is, brickwork not cast as in terra-cotta, but rubbed to section, or carved for ornament, came into general use. Instances of simple architrave mouldings in rubbed brick are to be found at West Woodhay and Rainham. But before rubbed brickwork came into general use, the seventeenth century builders had begun to feel their way towards a bolder use of ordinary brickwork. At Godalming in Surrey there are two houses which show a rudimentary attempt at decoration by panelling executed in ordinary brickwork with rubble filling-in. The later of these two houses is dated 1663. Pilasters and entablatures were now built frankly in brickwork, and probably one of the earliest examples is the house in Great Queen Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields, with brick pilasters and string courses, attributed to John Webb, Pocock's School, Rye, and a house in the High Street at Newbury (1669), are characteristic examples. The elevation of Pocock's[1] School, which is entirely of brick, consists of pilasters in three bays, on very high pedestals, with a brick entablature and an attic storey above, with three dormers with brick pediments. The designer made no attempt to adhere exactly to the orthodox rules of the Tuscan order, the order which he followed approximately. He subordinated his order to the exigencies of his brickwork, that is, he designed all his mouldings with

[1] Thomas Pocock, jurat of Rye, died between 1638 and 1644. By his will, dated 1638, he devised the school premises and certain rent charges to the Mayor of Rye and others, and these were conveyed to the Mayor in 1644. The exact date of the building erected from these funds is not known, but it appears to me from the details that it was probably built after the middle of the seventeenth century.

a view to their safe and easy execution in coarse-jointed brickwork, so that each course is securely bedded, and has a sufficient bearing in the wall. Yet the work is by no means ignorant. All the members of the order are there, in suggestion rather than in literal transcript, and, as in the case of a good many buildings of this date in England whose

POCOCK SCHOOL, RYE.

architect is unknown, this building was evidently the work of a strong and original designer, who thought for himself in the material which he employed. The arches over the windows are straight brick arches, channelled to form voussoirs and key-blocks. These are of rubbed brick, but coarsely jointed.

The use of fine rubbed brickwork with very thin joints seems to have been introduced by Wren early in the reign of Charles II., and

was probably suggested by the Dutch noblemen who came over with William. There are examples of its use in the doorways of King's Bench Walk and in the entrance to the Middle Temple,[1] in the Strand, where it is used for the wall surfaces; in the entrance to Christ's Hospital, next Christ Church, Newgate Street; in Kensington Palace, the Trinity House Almshouses, Emmanuel's Hospital, since destroyed, and many other instances in the eastern and southern counties. Wren, in fact, did more to extend the use of brickwork, and to show how it ought to be treated, than any architect who has ever practised in England. Bishop's Hostel, Trinity, Cambridge, dated 1670, is an early example of Wren's use of brick and stone, before he had fully mastered his art. It is picturesque, but a little immature in detail. Such houses, however, as Groombridge in Kent, Tyttenhanger near St. Alban's, Wotton House near Aylesbury, and Wren's beautiful combination of gauged brick and Portland stone in many of his buildings are unrivalled in their sober dignity, and in what one may call a certain graciousness in design. The well-known example in West Street, Chichester, which is attributed to Wren, shows the complete perfection of this manner of design. The elements on which it depends for its effect are extremely simple. The house is set back some little distance from the line of the street, from which it is separated by a red brick wall, with two piers of Portland stone in the centre, and wrought-iron entrance gates. A stone-flagged path leads to a flight of six steps, which contract as they ascend, with plain wrought-iron balustrades on either side. The street façade is recessed some 3 ft. 6 in., and the two wings have straight pilasters 20 in. wide at the angles, which project 1¼ in. beyond the face of the brickwork. A moulded stone band runs round the building at the level of the first floor, and a bold modillion cornice of wood marks the springing of the tiled roof. In the centre of the front is a frontispiece, constructed entirely of stone, which projects about 6 in. from the brickwork. The entrance is in the centre of this frontispiece, and is flanked by flat rusticated pilasters supporting a broken segmental pediment with a 'scutcheon in the centre. On the first floor the window has a stone architrave, with engaged brackets at the sides, and the frontispiece terminates in a pediment, within which is a monogram and the date 1696. The windows have straight arches of gauged brick, and were originally glazed with wood transoms and mullions and lead glazing in oblong panes, some of which remain in the

[1] The date on the Strand front is 1684.

L. Varney & Son, Buckingham, Photo.

WOTTON HOUSE, NEAR AYLESBURY.

Face p. 358.



CHORISTERS' SCHOOL, THE CLOSE, SALISBURY.

east side. These were replaced on the west side with sashes and small panes early in the eighteenth century; the windows to the front are modern, and have quite lost the scale of the original glazing. Certain irregularities in detail show here and there the hand of the unskilful workman. Wren was probably too busily employed to give much personal attention to a comparatively unimportant building, such as this, but all his extraordinary felicity of design appears in its beautiful proportions and spacing, in the delicate adjustment of materials, and, not least of all, in the insight shown into their colour relations. There are other instances of this kind of work in the Close at Salisbury and at Winchester, and, considering the number of examples which still remain in England, and their great beauty and reasonableness, it is curious that they should have hitherto received such scanty attention.[1]

Two causes seem to have led to the gradual disuse of brickwork for important buildings. Pedantic Palladians, such as Campbell, thought it too mean a material for buildings in the grand manner. Certain deviations from the orthodox canons were involved in the use of brickwork, and they preferred a material such as Bath stone, which could be cut into any shape they pleased. On the other hand, the eighteenth century amateurs of Gothic architecture, who considered that no building had caught the true mediæval manner unless it was prickly with pinnacles, found it cheaper to build sham castles in stucco and plaster than in honest brickwork. This position was further reinforced by the landscape gardener, who made the extraordinary discovery that red brick walls and chimneys looked very ill against foliage, and insisted that all old red brick buildings should be covered with stucco and painted white. This was, in fact, done to a great many red brick country houses; Heathfield in Sussex is an instance. After 1750 stucco architecture, to a great extent, superseded brick building, and the use of the latter was not really revived till about thirty years ago. Fortunately, houses in which no architect was employed continued to be built in excellent red brickwork till the end of the eighteenth century, and some very charming examples are to be found in the south of England, especially in Sussex, in which red brick and gray vitrified "headers" are combined with excellent effect. The house at Arundel, illustrated in the text, is an instance, and there is a fine example in the High Street of Wallingford, in which the dressings, arches, pilasters, and entablature are in red brick, and the wall face in gray. As usual, the

[1] Several excellent illustrations will be found in the series of plates now being issued by Messrs. Belcher and Macartney, B. T. Batsford, 94, High Holborn.

R. Keene, Photo.

OSMASTON HALL, DERBY.

Face p. 360.

old habits lingered on in country towns, and I have seen a house in Canterbury, built as late as 1840, which, except for some heaviness of touch, follows closely the eighteenth century manner. This, however,



HOUSE AT ARUNDEL, GRAY VITRIFIED BRICKS AND RED BRICKS.

is an exceptional instance, and the grace and kindliness of the domestic architecture inspired by Wren had long since disappeared.

It has been pointed out above that after the disappearance of terra-cotta in England no attempt was made to use brickwork for ornamental purposes till the middle of the seventeenth century. It is probable

that the free use of decorative plaster work, introduced by the Italians, had a good deal to do with this. The soft red bricks (known as rubbers), so freely employed by Wren, were not yet invented,[1] and where freestone for carving was not obtainable, modelled plaster work provided a cheap and effective method of decoration. It is probable that the elaborate plaster work at Nonesuch, executed by Italians for Henry VIII., was the first revelation to English workmen of the possibilities of this homely material. Simple stamped patterns they had been used to and pargetting, such, for instance, as the ceiling of Cobb's Hall, Aldington in Kent, which dates from the time of Henry VIII. But at Nonesuch for the first time they saw plaster work used with a freedom and mastery which suggested infinite possibilities of decoration; and it is certain that from this time forward plaster work took an entirely fresh start. How far the traditions of plaster work executed by Italian workmen in various parts of the country are founded on fact it is impossible to say in the absence of documentary evidence,[2] but there can be little doubt that these traditions are very much exaggerated, and the majority of these ceilings, said to have been executed by Italian workmen, are clearly English work; the tradition may have arisen from their having been given out at the time as executed in the Italian manner. The work at Nonesuch has long since disappeared. The Duke of Saxe-Weimar, writing early in the seventeenth century, says, "The labours of Hercules were set forth on the king's side, the queen's side exhibiting all kinds of heathen stories with naked female figures." There remain at Hardwicke Hall, however, both in the old house and in the new, plaster friezes of great importance and singular beauty. The fragment in the rooms of the old house is 8 or 9 ft. high; the design appears to have consisted of stags on either side of a tree, with tall lilies or some field plant dividing the repeat; there are no remains of colour, and the highest relief is about 3 to 4 in. The great frieze in the presence chamber of the new house was probably executed by the same artist; this frieze is 11 ft. high, the relief is about the same, but it is coloured.

[1] There is an early example in the architraves to the windows facing the base court at Rainham. The joints are rather wide, and though the bricks were certainly rubbed to section they are not what are technically known as rubbers. The same section is used at West Woodhay for the brick architraves to the windows of Inigo Jones's work.

[2] Mr. Robinson, Introduction to "Plastering, Plain and Decorative," by W. Millar, says that a De Rudolfi, probably a stucco worker, was in England in 1550, and that "Leonardo Ricciavelli, one of those who worked at the Palazzo Vecchio at Florence, came here in 1570; and Luca Romano, who had worked with Primaticcio at Fontainebleau, came here after Primaticcio's death," and was at work in England as late as 1586.



CEILING TO DRAWING-ROOM, STOCKTON, WILTS.

The principal subject is Diana and her nymphs under great forest trees; stags, lions, elephants, and camels are introduced, with the delightful recklessness of the early Renaissance, a recklessness, however, more apparent than real, for it was always controlled by an extremely subtle decorative sense; and in this frieze, though the details are isolated, yet the whole hangs together, and, helped by the delicate colouring, forms one of the most beautiful pieces of wall decoration to be found in this country. On the whole, this frieze is probably English work, but the man who did it had studied under Italians, and escaped the German influence which was superseding that fine tradition.[1] Examples of this German motive are found in the cartouches over the mantelpieces at Hardwicke, and during the reign of Elizabeth it became exceedingly popular, driving out the very much finer work of the earlier men of the century, and being in its turn superseded by the design of Inigo Jones.

Two schools of design can in fact be traced in the abundance of plaster work which remains to us from the sixteenth century. The first, and, in my opinion, by far the most important, is the English school, that is design executed by English workmen, and almost certainly designed by them, whether or not these men had originally learnt their craft from the Italians employed by Henry VIII. In this school I should include the friezes of Hardwicke, and that large class of ceilings which consist of moulded ribs, sometimes enriched with patterns, with free designs of animals and foliage in the intervening spaces; for the idea of this was essentially English and not Italian. The Italian idea of a ceiling was to coffer it deeply with elaborately moulded ribs; they actually left in England an example of this method in the ceiling of Bishop West's chapel at Ely (see Chap. I., p. 20), and reminiscences of the Italian coffered panel appear in such ceilings as that of the dining-room at Broughton Castle. (Gotch, Plate II.) The whole feeling and intention of such a ceiling as that of West's chapel is quite different from the English ceiling, where the rib is kept comparatively quiet, and the main effect of the design is to produce a rich continuous surface, adapted to diffusing the light instead of holding it. The ceiling in the long gallery at Knole is a beautiful example of this, a broad, flat moulded rib, enriched with bunches of grapes, forms the pattern, carnations and other flowers are worked in

[1] Mr. Robinson thinks it certain that Charles Williams was the plasterer who did this work. Williams seems to have been employed at Longleat, and among the Longleat papers are two letters from Sir William Cavendish asking for the services of this "cunning playsterer," who had "made divers pendants and other pretty things, and had flowered the Hall at Longleat."—"Plastering," p. 15.

R. Keene, Photo.

THE PRESENCE CHAMBER, HARDWICKE HALL, DERBYSHIRE.

Face p. 364.

low relief in the spaces, and a great deal of the plain ground is left to show. Other examples are found in the gallery at Haddon Hall, at Charlton, at Canons Ashley, and in the beautiful ceiling of the drawing-room at Stockton in Wiltshire. At Stockton the enrichment to the ribs was worked from a mould, whereas the work in the panels was worked by hand on the spot, and is on a totally different scale to that of the ribs. The apples and pears and bunches of grapes are in very high relief,



CEILING IN THE STAR INN, GREAT YARMOUTH.

forming isolated spots of light distributed over the ceiling, a peculiarity found in various ceilings of Wiltshire and Somersetshire, and lending some colour to the theory of travelling companies of plasterers who worked in certain districts. A still more remarkable instance exists at Great Yarmouth. In the Star Inn the ceiling of the old banqueting room is covered with a pattern formed of a moulded rib, and some of the intermediate spaces are filled in with a design of water-lilies, mallows, and other plants, modelled in very bold relief and with extraordinary vigour. In some of the spaces the ground is left plain,

and owing to modern alterations it is not easy to disentangle the principle on which the ornament is distributed. In the Nelson room in this house is another ceiling of the same date, but comparatively commonplace design, and it seems that the ceiling of the banqueting room is the entirely individual work of a singularly able artist. Other examples by the same hand are to be found in Great Yarmouth.

Another variation of the purely English ceiling is the ceiling with simple moulded ribs, worked in geometrical designs with pendants at



CEILING TO HOUSE IN WHITECROSS STREET, LONDON.

the intersections and foliations where the patterns run out on the ground. The hall at Littlecote has a good simple ceiling of this description, and there are characteristic examples at South Wraxhall, and in the withdrawing room of Lytes-Cary, where shields with crests and Tudor roses are worked at the meeting of the ribs.

The second school of design in English plaster work of the sixteenth century resulted from the free employment of Dutch and German workmen in the reign of Elizabeth. The principal motive of this design consisted of variations of strap-work, such as the well-known examples

at Blickling and Audley End. The ceiling of the library at Blickling is an important example, rather on account of its great size and curious fancy than from any particular excellence of design or execution. The library measures 127 ft. by 23 ft., and the entire ceiling is covered with ribs with allegorical figures of the Muses and of various moral sentiments in the compartments : the date is 1620-24. The ceiling of "the Fish-room" at Audley End measures 66 ft. by 30 ft., divided into thirty-two compartments, in each of which are represented fishes or aquatic subjects. The ceiling of the study has an extremely intricate strap-work pattern, which was used elsewhere in early seventeenth century work. A free use was made of cartouches as decorative panels, as in the example given from a house in Whitecross Street, since destroyed. Much of this work is valuable as giving texture to the surface of the ceiling, but it is inferior in interest to the more purely English method, and lacked the individuality which gave to the latter its particular charm.

PLASTER WORK, STANSTEAD.

The use of plaster work was by no means confined to interiors. Henry VIII. had used it boldly for the outside of his palace, Nonesuch. Owing, however, to its perishable nature, few examples of external plaster work on a large scale have survived. There is a fine example at Clare in Suffolk, and another at Wyvenhoe[1] near Colchester, where the whole of one side of a house is covered with a bold design, apparently all worked by hand. At West Drayton there is a gable covered entirely with a design in strap-work. The eastern counties are peculiarly rich in external plaster work. Besides such well-known instances as Sparrow's House at Ipswich, there is still to be found in the Suffolk villages a great quantity of simple pattern-work decoration

[1] Gotch, Plate CXVII.



PLASTER PANEL, HIGH STREET, CANTERBURY.



A CEILING IN CHESTERFIELD HOUSE.

(From Ware's "Complete Body of Architecture," pl. 81.)

[to face p. 368

of the seventeenth century, probably executed by the village plasterer, and exceedingly good of its kind. The instance from Stansted in Suffolk is a characteristic example. Plaster work for external decoration continued in use till the end of the seventeenth century. There is a good example in Bank Street at Maidstone, and on the first floor of a house in the High Street at Canterbury there are figures of Bacchus seated on a cask, surrounded by vines.[1] These date from about 1690,

THE OLD FISHPOND HOUSES. (FROM AN OLD PRINT.)

and one of the finest examples, the house opposite the Town Hall at Hertford, which is decorated with panels of bold acanthus scrolls, dates from the early part of the eighteenth century. Its use was abandoned at about this period, and when external plaster work was employed again, at the end of the century, it was on perfectly different lines. It was used as a cheap substitute for stone-work, pilasters and entablatures were made in stucco, and it is owing to the unreasonable and quite un-

[1] There are some large figures in plaster worked on the gables of some houses at Saffron Walden and dated 1676. They are, however, very poorly executed. The reproduction of the work on the old Fishpond houses appears to date from the end of the seventeenth century.

suitable use of the material that plaster work has fallen into a disrepute which it by no means deserves.

Meanwhile internal plaster work had undergone a very complete change. Inigo Jones had introduced an entirely fresh manner from Italy, using moulded ribs of greatly increased dimensions with panels of simpler design and very much greater size. There is a good early example at Ford Abbey. The plan of this ceiling is oblong, in the centre is a great oval with two oblong compartments at each end,



HOUSE AT SAFFRON WALDEN, ESSEX.

and the ribs have flat soffits filled in with leaves bound with a fillet, the sides being enriched with egg-and-tongue mouldings and beadings. The ground in this example is filled up with free arabesques, but in his more mature work Inigo Jones left the ground work free, and contented himself with masques, and boldly-designed swags of fruit and leaves for his friezes. The ceiling of the great saloon at Rainham is perhaps the most perfect example left of Inigo Jones's method of treating plaster. The room is of great height, and the detail of the ceiling is extremely bold. It is deeply coffered in compartments, and in the centre is an


¼. Design for ceiling to his Majesty's withdrawing
room at Greenwich 1666 from the original
drawing by John Webb in the collection at
Chiswick. The room being 34 6 long and
23 0 broad

PART OF CEILING DESIGNED BY JOHN WEBB, 1666, FOR HIS MAJESTY'S WITHDRAWING-ROOM AT GREENWICH.
(FROM A DRAWING AT CHISWICK.)

oval rib with modillions, heavily moulded, and a soffit enriched with fruit and flowers modelled in very high relief, but not undercut as in the later work of the seventeenth century.[1] The ceiling of the hall at Sydenham in Devonshire is a very good simple instance.[2] The ribs are filled in with apples and pears, modelled in high relief on a flat ground in a manner which reminds one of the much earlier work at Stockton. John Webb carried on this tradition, but his work is coarser and habitually inferior in execution; the ceiling of the dining-room at Thorpe Hall, fine as it is, shows clearly the falling off in delicacy of handling. Some of the plaster work, however, at Ashburnham House, is not inferior to the very best work done under Inigo Jones himself, and the ceiling of the Church of St. Charles the Martyr at Tunbridge Wells (1682-1690) shows that this tradition survived, though the fashion had already set in for the weaker and far less architectural methods of decoration borrowed by Wren from the architects of Louis Quatorze.

With Webb disappeared the last of this admirable tradition. Wren was still a young man with all his art to learn, and he rather unfortunately based his ornament on French models and the work then being carried on at the Louvre. The art of plaster work never recovered this disastrous impulse. The difference between Wren's technique and that of Inigo Jones is, that whereas Wren imported his detail wholesale and without any great reflection, Inigo Jones assimilated the motives that he borrowed from the Italian masters. His mind wrought upon them in such a way that, without losing their correctness in point of style, they became with him a personal and individual mode of expression, and not only that, but they became English in idiom and took their place in the line of English tradition. It is not difficult to see the relationship that exists between the modelling of the fruit and flowers on the great ceiling ribs at Rainham, and the bold relief of the detail executed in a ceiling so purely English as that of the drawing-room at Stockton. But Wren introduced the disastrous habit of taking detail on trust; with all his skill and genius as an architect, his ornament to the last was never quite free from a suspicion of the mannerisms of the amateur, and where Wren failed no one else was likely to succeed. Plaster work became more and more elaborate and more and more meaningless, and Wren was either too busy or too indifferent to do anything to arrest this decadence. The ornamental plaster work with

[1] An interesting and very crude attempt to copy Inigo Jones is to be found in the ceiling of the long room on the first floor of Sparrow's House at Ipswich.

[2] Gotch, Plate LXXIX.



PLASTER CORNICE, ASHBURNHAM HOUSE.

which he contented himself in the ceilings of his churches[1] has only one merit, it is usually right in scale; but it is as a rule trivial in the last degree, and the tendency to over-elaboration was intensified by the astonishing cleverness of Grinling Gibbons. This dexterous carver delighted in *tours de force*, sprays of foliage hanging by a twig, birds and fruit and flowers, carved indeed to the life, but without the slightest regard to that selection and subordination which are necessary to good architectural ornament. Most of Gibbons's ceilings, such as that of the



PART OF PLASTER PANEL, BURWASH, SUSSEX.

dining-room of Melton Constable, are believed to be carved in wood, but they were imitated as closely as possible in plaster with very unhappy results. The ceiling of the vestry of St. Lawrence Jewry is an instance. The carving here, which is very beautiful of its kind, was by Gibbons, and it is highly probable that he provided the ceiling as well. The exuberant design of rose and thistle above the east arch of St. Clement Danes shows some recollection of the less conventional ornament of Jacobean times; and such instances as the little panel over the entrance to a house at Burwash show that something of this spirit

[1] The ceiling of St. Mildred's, Bread Street, is an exception.



5 PLASTER SPANDREL IN THE RADCLIFFE LIBRARY, OXFORD.

survived till the end of the seventeenth century; but in London the professional architect was now an established person, and he was much more occupied with the niceties of Palladian design than with the details of craftsmanship. Instead of supplying designs for plaster work or carving he relegated the whole affair to the carver and plasterer, being perfectly satisfied that he would produce the accepted ornament of the time, neither more nor less. Gibbs refers with singular complacency to the fretwork "by Signori Artari and Bagutti, the best fret-workers that ever came into England,"[1] and the result of this confidence is seen in the deplorably vulgar plaster work to the ceiling of St. Martin-in-the-Fields. For the first half of the eighteenth century this rococo ornament continued in use, varied by the severely formal decoration allowed by the strict Palladians. Ware, in his "Complete Body of Architecture," was severe in his condemnation of the French, "who," he says, "have furnished us with abundance of fanciful decorations for these purposes, little less barbarous than the Gothic;" but Ware himself, though he designed ceilings on the lines laid down by Inigo Jones, allowed himself to borrow from the French, and some of his ceilings are scarcely less rococo than the work of Artari and Bagutti. Chambers confined himself to frets and guilloches and mechanical ornaments, or "when the utmost degree of richness in the decoration is aimed at, the ground of the compartment is likewise adorned either with paintings or with basso-relievo, representing grotesque figures, foliage, festoons, tripods, vases, and the like." The detail is correct but lifeless, and this remained the accepted method of decorating ceilings down to the middle of the present century. The only serious attempt at an original use of plaster work in the last century was made by Robert Adam, who brought back Pergolesi from Italy to do his plaster work, and obtained possession of the patent stucco invented by Liardet, and used it with great freedom both in the inside and outside of his buildings. Remains of the latter, in a very dilapidated state, may be seen on some of the houses in Fitzroy Square. Adam was very fond of filling in the tympana of arches with fan-shaped fluting, modelled in low relief. There is a good example of this in the east side of St. James's Street. His manner of internal decoration is very well known, both from his published designs and the many instances still left in London and elsewhere. Adam's ornament is not exciting, but it is nearly always graceful and very well spaced, and there is no doubt that it was an improvement on the meaningless

[1] Gibbs, "Book of Architecture," Plate VI.

detail which it superseded. It is very slight in relief and thin in design, and, as originally executed, its effect was usually heightened by tinting the ground. At Kenwood the stucco work was carried out by Rose, and coloured by Zucchi, who tinted the ground pink and green, Adam says, "to take off the glare." There are good examples of Adam's plaster work in the state bedroom at Blickling Hall, at Audley End, and in the dining-room of Mellerstain near Kelso, all of which ceilings preserve the original colouring. Adam's method was freely imitated at the time, and designs in this manner can be found in most of the pattern books published towards the end of the eighteenth century. A great quantity of work which is ascribed to Adam was not by him at all, but the work of comparatively unknown men who followed the fashion of the time, and employed this method of plaster work quite as skilfully as Adam or anyone else. Thomas and Charles Clark, Collins, Rose, and Joseph Papworth were all well known plasterers in the latter part of the last century. After Adam's death plaster work as a means of artistic expression disappeared; the classical men relapsed into frets and guilloches, and the Gothic enthusiasts produced plaster cusps and crockets in great abundance. It is only within the last thirty years that any attempt has been made to use plaster work on legitimate lines, and to get out of it the charming quality of texture and surface decoration of which it is undoubtedly capable.

Lead work is another of the crafts that has perished, partly through the callousness of the professional architect, partly through the demand that has grown up in the present century for the cheap reproduction in other materials of good and costly work. Cast iron has taken its place for rain-water heads and stack-pipes, cisterns and fountains, for all of which purposes lead was extensively used in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. Lead was constantly used in the sixteenth century for enrichments to friezes and ceilings, for which purpose repeating patterns were cast in lead, applied to the ground, and gilt or coloured. In Wolsey's closet[1] at Hampton Court the ceiling is formed in octagonal panels, divided by moulded ribs in wood, with balls and

[1] Law, i. 53. Mr. Law quotes Cavendish's metrical "Life of Wolsey":

> "My buildynges sumptuous, the coffres with gold and byse
> Shone like the sone in myd-day sphere,
> Craftely intayled, as connyng could devise
> With images embossed, most lovely did appear."

"Byse," or bright blue, and gold, were used in most of the "antyke work" at Hampton Court.

leaves in lead at the intersections; these and the ornaments inside the panels are gilt on a bright blue ground. "The antyk and letters" on the roof of the chapel at Hampton Court were cast in lead and gilt, and the lead for this and other work at Hampton Court, carried out under Wolsey and Henry VIII., was bought from Master Babington in Derbyshire. In the accounts for the building of a banqueting house at Greenwich for the king, in 1527 (Brewer, Calendar of State Papers, iv. 2, 3104), occurs an entry: "Paid to John Wildeman, brazier of London, for moulds brought to cast in lead at 6*d.* per lb., and repair of the same, named the broad leaf and the rose, the rose and the garnet, the leaf, the double ring, the double flower, the great pillar, the little flower, the 2 dolphins, the little pillar." In the same account appears an entry for "1700 little long leaves cast in lead."



LEAD CISTERN AT THE VYNE, BASINGSTOKE.

Lead was used for delicate applied ornaments in much the same way down to the end of the eighteenth century. Mr. Lethaby, in his book on lead work, says that it was freely used "in work influenced by the practice of the brothers Adam," and he quotes entries from the accounts for Somerset House, showing payments to Edward Watson in 1780[1] "for lead pateras from $2\frac{1}{2}d.$ to 10*d.* each; nineteen ornamental friezes to chimneys, £10 17*s.* 8*d.*; lead frieze to the bookcases in the Royal Academy Library at 2*s.* 6*d.* per foot; 137 feet run of large lead friezes in the Exhibition room at 4*s.*" Probably no instances of fountains in lead now exist. Frederic, Duke of Wurtemberg, who visited England about 1600, noticed that in the inner court of Windsor Castle there was "a curiously wrought fountain all of lead, several fathoms high."[2] There were lead cisterns at Theobalds large enough to bathe in, and there still exists an octagonal tank at St.

[1] "Leadwork," p. 82.

[2] Rye, "England as seen by Foreigners," p. 17.



LEAD CISTERN, EAST GRINSTEAD.

Fagan's Castle near Cardiff, 10 ft. across, dated 1620. Examples of these lead cisterns on a smaller scale are still found in England. Mr. Lethaby gives a charming example from Poundisford Park near Taunton, dated 1671. At the Vyne, near Basingstoke, there is a rectangular tank, 3 ft. 2 in. by 1 ft. 11 in. by 1 ft. 11 in., the front of which is divided into square panels with a flat moulded rib; these panels contain fleur-de-lis and pomegranates alternately, the date 1696, and initials E. K. In the eighteenth century this panel decoration was developed with some elaboration. There is a good example at Sackville College, East Grinstead, dated 1750, and some are still to be seen in the areas of houses in Southampton Street and the squares of Bloomsbury. The example in the South Kensington Museum, dated 1732, is the finest that remains. Mr. Lethaby says that plain panel cisterns of this kind were made as late as 1840.



RAIN-WATER HEAD, ST. JOHN'S, CAMBRIDGE.

The changes of style are shown more clearly in rain-water heads than in any other form of lead work; the earliest examples are simple in shape. One of the earliest examples is a lead head at Hampton Court dated 1528, and another with the initials of Henry VIII. At the end of the sixteenth century the plumbers began to vary the shape by square, irregular, or circular projections, like little turrets engaged on the rectangular box that formed the head, as in the instance from St. John's, Cambridge, and these were further ornamented by bands and patterns of bright solder, as at Knole, or solder combined with painting, as at St. John's, Oxford, or the Bodleian, which date from the early part of the seventeenth century. The famous lead heads at Haddon, which are of about the same date, are decorated with pierced panels set against the inner casing. A small square rain-water head on Leominster Church, dated 1668, shows about the last of the older and simpler treatment of lead for rain-water heads, and a marked change is evident towards the latter part of the seventeenth century. The plumber was now a very dexterous workman, and was ambitious of showing his skill in more recondite forms. Elaborate

moulded work was introduced, acanthus leaves and monograms, and all sorts of devices were worked and applied with great freedom. The example from Shrewsbury (1730), and the clumsy head at Melbourne, dated 1744, illustrate the change that was destroying English craftsmanship. The workman had long since passed the limitations imposed by technical inexperience, and could not resist the temptation to sacrifice his material and ignore the purpose of his work, if only he could turn out a masterpiece of mechanical skill. He was, indeed, an accomplished tradesman in the old-fashioned sense of the word, but he had ceased to be an artist.

Lead urns and lead figures for gardens and gateways used to exist in abundance in England. In the inventory of goods at Hampton Court, taken in 1659, "four large flower-pots of lead" are mentioned, but it is doubtful if the beautiful vases now in the gardens are the urns referred to. The best examples of these lead vases are to be found at Penshurst, at Melbourne in Derbyshire, and at Parham in Sussex. They used to be common enough in the older English gardens, but most of them have disappeared in recent years, and but few examples are left, either of these or of the lead figures which were cast in great



RAIN-WATER HEAD, SHREWSBURY, 1730.



RAIN-WATER HEAD, MELBOURNE, 1744



LEAD FIGURE OF ACTÆON, CARSHALTON.

numbers in the eighteenth century. In the Fellows' garden of Trinity Hall there were four lead figures of Learning, Cybele, Liberty, and Justice, each figure 5 ft. 9 in. high, standing on pedestals 3 ft. 6 in.; these were given by Sir Nathaniel Lloyd in 1722, at a cost of £79. The fine lead figures of Actæon and Artemis still stand on the great brick piers at Carshalton Park; there are several in the gardens at Melbourne, and four at Hardwicke in Derbyshire set in niches of yew. Mr. Lethaby has collected most of the examples still in existence in his account of lead statues.[1] The greater number of these figures were probably turned out at the famous lead yard in Piccadilly, established by a certain John Van Nost, a Dutchman who came over with William III., and whose business was sold in 1711. It was afterwards carried on by John Cheere, brother of Sir Henry Cheere the sculptor. Four other lead figure yards existed in Piccadilly in the middle of the eighteenth century, and Cheere's yard was not finally closed till his death in 1787. The lead figures and the lead urns went the way of the Formal Garden; they were swept away by false sentiment and pedantic taste. The amateurs condemned them as wanting in the refinement of a purer art, and the landscape gardener could find no place for them in his amazing schemes, and with them disappeared the last touch of fancy in English handicraft.

Foliage
Egg & tongue
Foliage
all carved as below
Lead figure of Actaeon Carshalton.
Pier grooms and bracket in Portland stone.
Red brick wall and wrought railing.
Height of wall 9' 4½
Height of piers 17' 0"
Lead figure about 7' 6" high. Bracket 4' 8" high. Egg & tongue 6½ centre to centre.
Panels on side of pier carved with musical instruments, foliage & trophies of game.
Plan.

[1] For a fuller account I must refer the reader to Mr. Lethaby's book, sect. xiv. I may also refer to "The Formal Garden," p. 215-222.

The history of ironwork in England since the days of mediæval art is rather curious in that the smith's art appears to have been revolutionized almost entirely by one man. Throughout the sixteenth, and first half of the seventeenth century, the English smith was content with simple and unambitious work. The grille round Henry VII.'s tomb at Westminster seems to have been the last effort of the mediæval iron-worker. The very remarkable wrought iron gates into West's chapel at Ely are probably later, but they are not English work, and are almost certainly Flemish. English smiths, from the time of Elizabeth till the Restoration, do not seem to have been capable of anything but the most simple grilles, composed of plain or twisted bars with some rudimentary crestings and ornaments to the angle standards. At Currey Rivell in Somersetshire there is a characteristic example. This incloses a monument, dated 1593, with rather delicate Renaissance detail, probably made by a professional tomb-maker, but the grille is evidently of local workmanship, and consists of a rail 4 ft. 9 in. high, of alternate square and twisted bars, set $3\frac{1}{2}$ in. centre to centre. Above this is a band of scrolls formed of iron bands, 2 in. by $\frac{1}{8}$ in., hammered flat and shaped in the centre, and above this is a cresting of alternate spear and trefoil heads, $8\frac{1}{4}$ in. high, shaped and hammered out flat. At the angles are square iron standards with wrought iron finials, formed with $1\frac{1}{4}$ in. bars. The smith's work, that is the forging and hammering, is good

LEAD URN, PARHAM, SUSSEX.

and thorough, but the design is kept within the most direct and simple lines attainable. The finial to the rails round the Walter monument in Ludlow Church, dated 1592, shows another not less primitive method of ornament. The chancel gates to Newbury Church are an instance



GRILLE, CURREY RIVELL.

of ordinary English seventeenth century ironwork. The gates are formed of alternate square bars, $\frac{5}{8}$ in. thick, set diagonally, and of rough twisted bars measuring $\frac{3}{4}$ in. Every fourth upright has a pointed head, and between these are crestings of pierced sheet iron $\frac{1}{8}$ in. thick. The crestings of the standards of the grille round the Tanfield monument in Burford Church, Oxfordshire, date about 1625, are formed in much the

same way, out of cut sheet iron, $\frac{1}{8}$ in. thick, set four way round the standard, but the shaft of the latter is ingeniously opened out at the head and forged together again into a point. Ironwork of this simple character continued in common use till the Restoration, and, in fact, survived till the end of the seventeenth century. The ironwork of the balcony, and the rods to the clock of Guildford Town Hall (1683), show no trace of Tijou's influence, and examples in the ironwork to the signs of country inns carry on the old tradition into the eighteenth century. Such ironwork as remains in buildings designed by Inigo Jones, or under his immediate influence, shows no attempt at any fresh departure from this traditional English method. The only variations that occur are in such minor details as 'scutcheons, door handles, and casement fasteners, some of which are elaborate in design and of very excellent workmanship. Those illustrated in the text exist in a late seventeenth century house at Guildford.



IRON STANDARD, BURFORD, OXFORDSHIRE.

The man who entirely altered the character of wrought iron work in England was Jean Tijou, a Frenchman, who came to England soon after the Restoration, possibly at Wren's suggestion. It appears that Tijou was employed at Hampton Court as early as 1670.[1] When Wren began his designs for rebuilding the Palace in 1689 Tijou

[1] See Mr. Starkie Gardiner's introduction to the reprint of Tijou's "New book of drawings invented by John Tijou, containing several sortes of Iron-worke, etc. London, 1693," published by B. T. Batsford, 1896.

was again employed, and between 1689 and 1693 executed the magnificent series of gates and screens which used to ornament the gardens of Hampton Court.[1] These gates are, on the whole, the finest specimens of wrought iron work to be found in England. They were at one time attributed to an Englishman, Huntingdon Shaw of Nottingham, on the strength of an inscription in Hampton Church. It has been ascertained that the words in the inscription in question were added in 1833,[2] and though there is evidence that Shaw assisted Tijou in his work both at Hampton Court and St. Paul's, there is no doubt that the design of all



CASEMENT FASTENER, GUILDFORD.

this work was by Tijou, and that the great development in English ironwork which appeared towards the end of the seventeenth century was due to his extraordinary skill. Tijou also executed ironwork at Chatsworth for Talman, and at Burleigh, and it has been suggested that he designed the gates of the Clarendon Press at Oxford. (The beautiful ironwork at All Souls' seems rather later.) The latest entry in regard

[1] The finest of these stood originally in the Private Gardens at Hampton Court. They were removed to the Great Fountain Garden in 1736, and again to the railing between the House Park and the Long Walk. They were finally moved to South Kensington by Sir Henry Cole. A full account will be found in Mr. Starkie Gardiner's introduction.

[2] See a paper by Mr. Garraway Rice, "Archæological Journal," June, 1895.



GATES, ALL SOULS', OXFORD.

DETAIL OF GATES, ALL SOULS', OXFORD.



PART OF GATES, BEVERLEY MINSTER.

to Tijou occurs in the accounts of St. Paul's in 1711. The book of his published designs, though of very great interest, gives an utterly erroneous impression of his executed work. Many of the designs shown are too florid and elaborate for their purpose, and a certain clumsiness of line, from which Tijou's actual work was completely free, was possibly due to the inadequate version of the engravers.

Throughout the first half of the eighteenth century the manner introduced by Tijou continued in use. Wrought iron unfortunately does not stand exposure so well as cast, and the life of this wrought iron work in England, unless very carefully watched and repaired, does not appear to be more than some 200 years; but there still remain a great number of examples of this beautiful art in almost every part of England, and particularly in the neighbourhood of London. The Chiswick gates, now set in front of Devonshire House, are a particularly fine example, and the gates and railings at Carshalton Park are of about the same date. The total length of this railing is 113 ft. At either end are Portland stone piers, 17 ft. high, with lead figures of Actæon [1] and Artemis, and in the centre are folding gates, 12 ft.

[1] See illustration, p. 382.



GATES, SHERBORNE ABBEY.



IRON SQUARE STANDARD, KING'S LYNN.

high and 13 ft. wide, with smaller gates at the sides, and elaborate head-pieces set between wrought iron piers with moulded caps and bases. The probable date of this work is about 1723, the date of Leoni's design for the great house of Carshalton, of which it seems that these entrance gates and piers are the only part that was ever carried out. The entrance gates to the churchyard at Hampstead (1745) are rather later. Another variation is illustrated in the gates at Sherborne, which date from about the middle of the eighteenth century, and show a somewhat different motive in design, other examples of which are to be found in a gate to St. Peter's, Covent Garden, and at Queen's, Cambridge.

Towards the end of the eighteenth century the art rapidly degenerated, riveting took the place of welding, the designs were meagre and insignificant, and cast iron gradually superseded wrought. The art lingered on till the beginning of the present century in the country. At King's Lynn, for instance, there appears to have been a smith who followed the older fashion as late as 1803. But in this as in the other handicrafts the record of the nineteenth century has been disastrous. It has stifled the fine tradition of English craftsmanship, and its repeated experiments in the various arts have ended with depressing regularity in a *cul-de-sac.*

CHAPTER XVI.

Conclusion.

In a certain sense dates and periods in architecture are arbitrary, for ideas in art do not die, and long after the fashion has shifted artists will appear, born out of date as it were, who revert to older methods and give a semblance of vitality to traditions that are almost dead. It is impossible to assign any definite date as the end of that new departure in English art which began in the reign of Henry VIII. Broadly speaking, however, the initial impetus of the Italian Renaissance had run itself out in England by the end of the eighteenth century. From first to last it had formed the predominating influence in English architecture for some 300 years, yet with many variations and vicissitudes. Both in its development and decay it moved slowly, and in its later history changed by such imperceptible degrees that the extent of its downward course is scarcely realized till one has reached the end. Fully one hundred years were taken up in experiment, for the Renaissance did not spring into full existence in England in the sixteenth century. It was at first an exotic, imported by those more highly educated Englishmen who first appreciated the Italian humanists, men who travelled in Italy not to study its art, but its letters. In its first introduction it was an affair of scholarship, and to some extent of accident. In the south of England the way was more or less open in the channels, through which Italian trade had penetrated into this country for some generations. But far away on the extreme north-west border there is to be found in the choir of Carlisle Cathedral a fragment of a screen which is obviously French in design and execution. This screen was put up by Lancelot Salkeld, first Dean of the Cathedral, in about 1532. It is quite certain that no English workman at the time could have made this screen, and the appearance of this comparatively mature French Renaissance art in such an unlikely place is only to be accounted for by some personal incident in Salkeld's life, or by his employment of some French travelling artist from beyond the border. In either case it was more or less of an accident, coming as it were out of due

course, and not from the slow development of local life. The natural consequence of this condition of affairs was that the first attempts at the Italian manner made in this country savoured of the amateur rather than of the fully trained artist. They were tentative, realized in details, in sculpture, and decoration rather than in architecture. As has been already pointed out the work that the Italians did for Wolsey and Henry VIII. at Hampton Court was practically confined to sculpture, modelling, and painting. The fact that it was limited to ornament shows that for many years the movement was literary rather than artistic, an incident in the revival of letters rather than anything approaching the great artistic movement which formed at least half of the Italian Renaissance itself. So late an example as Shaw House (1581) illustrates clearly this aspect of it; the architecture is that of an ordinary Elizabethan house, but about the building are Italian details of unusual excellence, and over the door there is an inscription in Greek, φθονερός μηδείς ἐισιτῶ, evidently the personal fancy of a somewhat pedantic owner.[1] The Renaissance in England was, in fact, for the first half of the sixteenth century, practically a court affair, and by no means commended itself to the English people in general. Evidence of this exists in contemporary writers, but the strongest evidence is found in the persistent retention of mediæval methods of domestic building long after Renaissance ornament was freely admitted in details. Dr. Creighton has pointed out, in regard to scholarship, that the English people were extremely slow to adopt the new ideas. The consequence was that through the sixteenth century in England their expression was tentative and uncertain, and the only explanation of their constant change is to be found in English politics of the time. Henry's break with Rome brought the first essay in Italian art to a close which is startling in its abruptness. The Italians returned to their own country or to France, and when Elizabeth ascended the throne the last of them, with unimportant exceptions, had left our shores. England was now a Protestant country, and Flemings and Germans found in it a refuge from persecution in their own countries, and, in the uncertain taste of the time, and the passion for building which few Elizabethan noblemen escaped, constant employment for their ingenuity and mechanical skill. These men were not artists but extremely dexterous workmen. They had little of the subtle instinct of the Italian,

[1] Above the first floor windows is inscribed:

"Edentulus vescentium dentibus invidit,
Et oculos caprearum talpa contemnit."

that quality which placed the work of the latter beyond the reach of mere industrious effort; and it was for this reason that the English



GARDEN DOOR, SHAW HOUSE, NEWBURY.

craftsman very soon got abreast of the Germans and eventually drove them from the field. The influence of the Germans gradually declined,

and the closing of the Steelyard at the end of the sixteenth century pretty well coincides with the date of the recovered ascendancy of the English workman.

He was still, however, far below the Italian ideal of an artist. He had learnt to build and to carve, but his design was worse than ever. He depended on pattern books. He had lost the spontaneous vivacity of the late mediæval craftsman, and had thoroughly bewildered himself with the five orders. By the beginning of the seventeenth century he had reached a degree of mechanical accomplishment and artistic uncertainty to which the art of the latter part of this century affords a very close parallel. These men were like an army without leaders. The co-operative art of the middle ages was no longer possible, some one must take the lead. A strong individual intelligence was needed to restore order in this chaos of eclecticism, and to compel these scattered elements back into the path of ordered and logical art. At the right moment, when the workman-designer had come to a standstill, a genius of this order appeared in Inigo Jones. Comparatively little is really known of this great artist; only rare glimpses of a reserved and commanding personality can be caught from the scanty remains of his work, yet his figure looms large in the background of English art, for he was, in a word, the founder of modern architecture in England. Collective architecture, that is, architecture designed and executed by groups of men, was only practicable so long as there was no possibility of building in any but a single traditional style, well defined and well understood. As soon as other methods of design became possible and entered into consciousness, selection had to be made, and with this of necessity came in individual choice and individual control. In architecture the work of the Renaissance was to substitute the individual artist for groups of artists; whether this was desirable or not is hardly worth considering, it was the inevitable result of a change in the conditions of social life, and it was the essential service which Inigo Jones rendered the art of this country, that he cleared away the confusion in which English artists were losing their way, and taught them to recognize the fact that under modern conditions as opposed to mediæval, architecture must be an individual affair; and further, that architecture is an art with its own limits and ideals, not dependent on sculpture and painting as the mediævalist had made it, but complete within itself and capable of realizing its full effect by simple qualities of line, mass, and proportion. It is this which differentiates the work of Inigo Jones from that of the Jacobean or Elizabethan designers, and gives it its extreme importance. He stamped

English art with something of his own distinction, and gave it an impetus not entirely extinct even at the present day.

The break between Inigo Jones and Wren is inconsiderable. The civil wars brought about a temporary check, but Wren's lucid intelligence very soon found the way back to the lines laid down by Inigo Jones. The modifications Wren introduced were mainly a matter of temperament. His easy tolerance admitted a certain licentiousness of detail which would hardly have satisfied the severer taste of his predecessor. Yet Wren was thoroughly English, and, in his happy compromise, exactly hit the English temperament, for though the eighteenth century architects repudiated his authority, it is evident that Wren's manner was understood and appreciated by the English people, and it was this, and not the Palladianism affected by Lord Burlington's clique, that became the vernacular architecture of the country. The fifty years from the Restoration to the death of Queen Anne, were, in fact, the culminating point of modern English architecture. Both architects and workmen thoroughly understood the technique of the style in which they were working, and, till the beginning of the eighteenth century, there was little of that fatal severance between architecture and building which was destined in another hundred years to bring about the degradation of both. Yet even before Wren died the disease had begun, and the fault lay with the architects. Their vanity led them to magnify architecture into a fine art and a mystery, and their cupidity to hand over its control to the ignorance of wealthy amateurs. As for the builder, they left him out of account, and the poor man had to make the best he could of designs made without regard to materials or climate, and which were, in fact, little more than academical exercises. Many of these designs were extremely fine in themselves, and several of the eighteenth century architects were very able men; but an art such as architecture, based on the actual facts of existence, cannot afford to be insane. When once the clue of use and reasonableness was abandoned no further limit to architectural experiment existed. If Italian villas could be imported wholesale, so also might mediæval castles or Greek temples; and in this way the great tradition of English art was lost, and the history of the hundred years from 1770 onwards has been nothing but a series of experiments in different styles, less interesting than those of the sixteenth century, because more artificial and insincere.

Yet, if English architecture is considered from its first beginnings, and compared in its general tendency with the art of other countries, it is possible to trace a permanent element throughout its manifold changes,

a definite bent towards certain qualities in design. Anyone who studies the history of architecture must feel that behind all the classifications and artistic genealogies which are prepared for us there lurks an elemental force which defies exact analysis and classification. It is fluid, constantly changing its form, yet always there, always impressing us with the notion that this, if one could only get at it, would be the clue by which to find our way through these bewildering changes of technique. It is no affair of details. When one has mastered the various classes into which laborious antiquarians have divided Gothic architecture, when one has overcome the distinctions of the orders which form the pons asinorum of classic, one is still as far from grasping its character as ever. These are no more than the words and the syntax of architecture; architecture itself is something very much greater, something beyond and outside all this. There is at the back of these words and of this syntax an intelligence which informs and vitalizes them; an idiosyncrasy which colours them with its own individuality; some deep-set quality which differentiates the architecture of one country from that of another; and without which, indeed, architecture would be a mere plaything and fashion, unworthy of study, something apart from the serious stream of human development.

In individual work the key to a work of art is the man himself, his habits, his whole way of regarding life. To fathom the meaning of a picture of Leonardo one has to recall the dreamer and the poet—the intellectual exquisite, the man of extreme physical beauty; the austerity of Inigo Jones's architecture is better understood, when one realizes the stiff unbending nature of the man, that proud, masterful temper which earned the undying hatred of Ben Jonson. So, too, with Wren, his easy, kindly nature is written in his work; and if this is so with individuals, still more must it be the case in the art of a great people. For the individuality of race is stronger than that of genius, and the art of the English people can only be understood by the help of some insight into the past history and character of the English people themselves. Behind their art there stands the permanent human equation, the point of view from which they approached existence, their method of life and the ideals at which they aimed. In other words, it is necessary to form some idea of their constitutional habit of mind, and to grasp the psychological standpoint which results from the mental and moral qualities of the race, so much so, indeed, that it is very doubtful if any foreigner can fully understand the art of an alien race. In an old civilization this standpoint is intensified by the mere lapse of time, and

one has to take into account the effect of the long-continued maintenance of the same point of view acting and reacting on inherited ideas of what is reasonable and beautiful. The son profits by the experience of the father, and in this way there accumulates a large reserve of artistic knowledge and insight—in other words, a tradition of taste, which increases till the tide turns, and the rich stream runs itself out into the quicksands of copyism.

From this point of view, then, one may define tradition as an inherited psychological standpoint in regard to art. Under different forms and varying expressions the same tendencies repeat themselves in generation after generation, so that a continuous line of thought at length discloses itself in the history of our art. Certain instinctive preferences develop into a subtle and permanent influence always at work upon the art of the country, and it is only in a long survey of its history that this local colour is clearly seen. Even in the rude beginnings of our architecture certain tendencies are evident, which, with every generation, gained in force and staying power. In England, as in other countries of Europe, architecture (as apart from ornament) began with the heritage of the Romans, a heritage ill understood by those who came into it, yet the starting-point from which modern architecture was to grow. Now from the very first the difference of race asserted itself. When the Normans conquered England they brought with them their own accomplished versions of round arched architecture to supersede the cruder art of the Saxon. Yet it was the latter race who in the long run gave to English art its peculiar bias. Norman architecture, at any rate, in common with the Romanesque of other countries, derived its descent from the round arch of the Romans ; but the branches of this family soon separated so widely that one can barely recognize their kinship. Contrast, for instance, the archway of Iffley, or the mighty pillars of Durham, with the porticoes of Lombardy and the south of France. In both there is the barbaric love of ornament, the indomitable savagery of a half-civilized people ; but here, in England, its expression is more primitive, something of the vigorous open-air energy of the northern peoples seems to have stamped itself on their work—the simplicity of taste and directness of purpose of a race who spent the best part of their existence in fighting by land and sea. One finds in it, if one may so put it, a certain sportsmanlike contempt for anything trivial or irrelevant. But turn to such work as the west front of St. Gilles, or the gateway of St. Trophimus at Arles, and it is evident that the sculptor who carved these grim figures, and the savage beasts

beneath them, must have looked at life from a different standpoint. In his veins still lingered the blood of the men who had found their pleasure in the tortures of the amphitheatre; his work is burning with the turbid passion of the South. It is the work of men who had no instinctive aversion to cruelty. The race asserts itself at once, and thus early began in England the promise of that sober dignity which was to be the essential characteristic of our later art. The artistic reticence, the even sanity of thought, which are traceable in the first beginnings of English architecture, continued to be its keynote, as one may say, throughout all its subsequent history. Contrast again Salisbury and Notre Dame, the austere asceticism of line in the first with the perfect sculpture of the latter. Always in the Frenchman one finds a certain expansiveness, an irresistible impulse to let himself go; and in the Englishman, at his best, a certain self-repression, a strong determination to keep his thought and its expression well in hand. The consummate technical skill of the French architect and sculptor enabled them to produce in their great cathedrals absolute masterpieces of form and workmanship, so that in their unrivalled attainment they stand on the level of the earlier Greeks; but the Englishman was after different ideals. His nature was possibly deeper, at least more self-contained; he seemed to care less about attracting attention, more about expressing himself in his own characteristic way. The playfulness, the kindly humour, at least, so one imagines it, of the Saxons, asserted itself in the long run, weaving delicate fancies as it attained its full maturity, expressing itself in the exquisite imagery of the Chapter House of Ely, or the rich carving of Somerset, or in the admirable woodwork and colour of the churches of the eastern counties. In all of these one recognizes a quality peculiarly English, something familiar to us now, in spite of all that has gone between, a message in our own language from the far-distant past which we can understand to this day. One may admire the mediæval architecture of France and Spain, yet an Englishman cannot get into touch with it, as he can with the architecture of his own country; and the reason why he can still understand the latter, is that the character of the race has not changed fundamentally, and that the old tradition still remains, though it has been dormant in England for these last hundred years.

Throughout the successive periods into which antiquarians have divided English-Gothic, the continuity of this tradition is unquestioned. Its expression was altered by gradual changes and modifications, till the Gothic of the fifteenth century is something very different from the

Gothic of the thirteenth. But the stream remains the stream, whether it glides through the level fields, or dashes down the mill-race, and no one is likely to be deceived by the change of phrase, as one may put it, into supposing that Perpendicular Gothic is something different in kind from Early English. It has been urged, however, that when the Renaissance came all this was changed, that the old tradition died, that the Renaissance came like the old man of the sea, sprang on the back of a beautiful art and strangled it; and, as the logical conclusion from this that the history of English architecture ceases with the disappearance of Gothic. This view, I think, is neither sound philosophy nor honest history. It could hardly be urged by any but the most bigoted partisan that King's College Chapel shows any falling off, in vigour of design and execution, from the old tradition. King's College Chapel was begun early in the sixteenth century, almost in the very year in which Torrigiano came to England, and it has been represented as the last effort of the old tradition. In a sense it is, if by tradition is merely intended technical tradition; but if tradition is taken in that larger sense which I have endeavoured to give to it, how is it possible to conceive that a spirit which was still capable of such a magnificent effort as King's, and which was deep-set in a race so essentially conservative as the English, should suddenly disappear? It is not possible to imagine such a catastrophe, nor did any such abrupt lacuna in the chain of tradition ever actually happen. So engrained was the older feeling that, long after the technique of Renaissance architecture had established itself in England, the older methods of expression lingered on, cadences, as it were, too beautiful to be readily forgotten.

This, however, was no more than a survival of detail; the essential point is, that after the forms and methods of mediæval architecture had died out, there yet survived this permanent element of English tradition, an element outside all changes of style, and I cannot illustrate this more clearly than by the work of Inigo Jones himself. Inigo Jones was absolutely steeped in Palladianism. He had studied profoundly the works of Palladio in Italy, comparing and noting the actual remains of Roman architecture, assimilating all that the great Italian masters had taught and practised. He returned to England, probably, so far as he was conscious of it, resolved to introduce Palladianism pure and simple into his own country; but so masterful a genius is seldom conscious of his full intention. There were forces within him and around him stronger than he could be aware of. He could not escape the tradition of his country, and his work, in its masculine austerity, is as thoroughly

English as the massive walls of Tewkesbury. The Banqueting House, for instance, is a deliberate design in the manner of Italian Renaissance architecture; so, too, are certain of the London clubs, built in direct imitation of well-known Italian palaces. But whereas the latter are obviously copies of a foreign building, the Banqueting House is unmistakably English, the work of a man who had absorbed into his own intelligence all that he had to learn from the art of another country, and who, by force of his own understanding and the tradition of his race, was able to make that art his own. It may be thought, indeed, that the extent of a man's genius as an artist is shown not least of all by his capacity for absorbing and assimilating tradition. It is this which enables him to give to his work that mysterious quality of style which can be felt but never defined—without which, indeed, no work, however able and at first sight impressive, is ever likely to retain its place in the permanent recognition of mankind. It is this capacity which enables him to reach the abiding element which outlasts all fashion, to touch the bottom rock of tradition—to return, as it were, to the deepest sources of art, namely, to the instincts of his race, those deep-seated likes and dislikes which no individual genius, however gifted, can defy.

In the history of architecture it is precisely in those men who have far outdistanced their contemporaries in permanent reputation that one finds the traditional sense most strongly developed. Wren was the most English of all English architects. He went to see Bernini in France, and talked with Mansard and Perrault, yet their influence on him was merely superficial. It spoilt his ornament, but left his essential faculty of design untouched. And in his later work, when he knew himself and was more completely master of his own language, he tended more and more to what we may call a purely English idiom in architecture. He consolidated the English tradition so surely that, for nearly a hundred years after his death, his example was adhered to in what has been called vernacular architecture, in spite of all the academical pedantries of Campbell, Kent, Lord Burlington, and other gentlemen of taste and fashion. Even Vanbrugh's architecture, huge, enormous, and unwieldy, if it was not English, was certainly nothing else, and the best of the eighteenth century architects, Hawksmoor, Gibbs, Ware, and Sir William Chambers, followed the old school, and adhered, though with ever-failing fidelity, to the old tradition. Their work was at least "solid, masculine, and unaffected"—words which Inigo Jones once used to describe his conception of what architecture

should be, and which most admirably epitomize the best tradition of English art.

For, throughout this period, English architecture was simple and direct in design, and, in all the best examples, admirably sane; we alone of European peoples steered clear of rococo art, the decadence of the Renaissance. Our latter work grew dull, even insipid, yet in a way it never lost its self-respect, and, at any rate, down to the end of the last century, it suffered less than the art of other countries from the audacity of impudence. Even Nash, and the plaster architects of the early part of this century were not so vulgar as the Germans of the eighteenth century. Yet it is unfortunately the case that for the last hundred years or more this tradition has been overlaid with fashion after fashion; first by Robert Adam with his flimsy invention, then by the graver but still artificial manner of Wilkin, and Decimus Burton, and since their time by all sorts of aberrations, neo-French, Italian and Spanish Gothic, German and Flemish revivals, and a hundred other caprices which are not worth consideration, and can have no permanent place in the history of English architecture. For, indeed, the Gothic revival, now disappearing, has had two sides to it. In so far as it taught men to break with conventional rules, to resist the tyranny of formula, and to think for themselves, its work was good, and had its use. But moral sincerity and enthusiasm are not art, and in so far as the Gothic revival taught false history and ignored three hundred years or more of permanent work and good tradition, its influence has been pernicious. It was, on the whole, the work of amateurs; and though any amateur who can handle his pen can take his part in breaking down tradition, it requires generations of able and determined artists to build one up again. For tradition, nowadays, hangs by a thread, and it is only by a steady resistance to fashion and caprice that it can be delivered from this precarious state.

It is perhaps impossible to define more exactly the exact nature of this tradition. It is not, indeed, any one quality, but rather a group of qualities tending in one direction, making always for sanity and reticence in art, and persistently avoiding the excesses of immature design; and it results from two causes, first, from a certain definite tendency of demand on the part of the English people, due to many generations of settled civilization, and on the other hand, from the various answers made to this demand by artists, answers dictated partly by conscious choice, partly by inherited instinct. It is thus mixed up with the character of the race itself, and its continued exist-

ence depends on the continuance of the individuality of the race. It is on this ground that tradition inevitably becomes fainter, in so far as distinctions of national character tend to disappear, and the process of fusion noticed in regard to local methods of handicraft has a far wider application when considered in relation to the art of different races.

It is indeed an open question whether any such tradition as I have attempted to indicate can grow up again in English art. Modern conditions are undoubtedly against it. The arts do not at this moment express the finest intelligence of the country. That intelligence is concentrated in other channels, and has left its mark in science, in immense commercial enterprise, in almost every form of intellectual activity other than the arts. The latter are not at present regarded as worthy of serious and sustained attention, and until some reasonable standard of judgment has grown into recognition among educated people it is not likely that there will be any general improvement in English architecture. It is at this point that a wider system of education might help the artist. It can do nothing for his technique, but it can at least help to find him the right environment.



URN ON ONE OF THE GATE PIERS, HAMPSTEAD MARSHALL.
(SEE P. 189.)

INDEX.

Pages 1-186 *are in Volume I.*

ABBEY Dore Church, 140; screen (*plate*), 60, 66; woodwork, 62, 63, 64.
Abbot's Hospital, Guildford, 5.
Abel, John: life and works, 60-66, 140, 330.
Abingdon Town Hall, 130, 254; *illus.*, 341, 347.
Acroyde, John, 57, 58, 60.
Adam, James: life and works, 272-275.
Adam, Robert: life and works, 259, 260, 272-275, 317, 342, 403; decoration, 254; galleries, 301; Harewood House, 261; masonry, 342; planning, 290; plaster work, 376, 377; top-lighting, 297.
Adam, Robert and James: life and works, 244, 252, 268, 272-275; Kedleston, 256; publications, 318, 319.
Adam, William, father of the brothers Adam, 272.
Adams, provost of King's, Cambridge, 239.
Adelphi Buildings, 272, 273.
Admiralty, the (*plate*), 222; Ripley and Adam, 223; screen and gateway, 273, 275.
Agecroft, 325, *note.*
Akerman's views of Christ Church, Spitalfields, 204.
Albany, the, 264.
Albemarle Street: Ware and, 244.
Alberti, 2, 35, 92, 303.
—— on Architecture: Bartoli's Italian Version, 310; Leoni's English Version, 228, 310.
Aldrich, Henry, Dean of Christ Church, 208-210, 305-307; and Westminster dormitory, 226.
All Hallow's, Derby, 238, 312.
—— Lombard Street, 158.
—— London Wall, 269.
All Saints, Oxford: elevation (*illus.*), 209; design, 210, 305.
All Souls', Oxford, 70; north quadrangle, 204, 206; ironwork, 387; gates (2 *illus.*), 388, 389.
All Souls' Library: Wren's drawings, 154, 172, 173; Wren's plans (*illus.*), 282, 292; *illus.*, 293, 295; drawings for St. Paul's, 166, 167, 169, 170; other drawings, 172, 173, 178, 225; plans, 182, 184, 191, 292-295.
Allarton, Lord: Wren's design for house, 292.
Allen, Ralph, 248, 249.
Almerigo, Paolo: villa by Palladio, 221, 224.
Alresford, the Grange at, 270.
Altar, Christ Church, Oxford, by Rovezzano, 12.
—— high, Henry VII.'s Chapel, 9, 10.
Altar-piece, Jacobean, at Northiam, 136.
Amadas, goldsmith's work, 8.
Amateur architects, 208-212, 229.
Amesbury: entrance pier (*illus.*), 124; garden house (*illus.*), 77, 78; masonry (*illus.*), 336, 337; plan (*illus.*), 282, 284; Inigo Jones, Webb and, 120, 123.
Ampthill House: Thorpe and, 42, 44, 45, 50; gallery, 80.
Anne, Queen: Act to build fifty churches, 234; statue, 234.
Answorth: Paine and, 256.
Antwerp: Hôtel des Villes Hanséatiques, 34.
Archer, Thomas: life and works, 190, 191, 214-216, 259, 308.
Architect, 27-31, 51, 138, 217, 246, 330; the amateur, 208-212, 229; builders, 123, 301, 338, 344-347.
Architectural literature, 86-96, 302-319.
Argyll, Duke of: and Campbell, 217; and Gibbs, 233.
Armada: money from wrecks used for Longford, 49.

Arnold, William: and Wadham College, 27, 28, 52, 58, 60.
Artari: plaster work, 236, 239-241, 347, 376.
Artists, Incorporated Society of: Paine, President, 259.
Arundel: house at, 360; *illus.*, 361.
—— Earl of: and Inigo Jones, 98, 104; and masques at Court, 100; and Nonesuch Palace, 16; tomb, 5.
—— House, old, 182.
—— William, 145.
Ashburnham House: designs, 314; plaster work, 372; *illus.*, 373; staircase, 278, 279 (*illus.*), 332; Inigo Jones and Webb and, 121, 123.
Ashdown House, 130 (*plate*).
Ashmolean Museum, 152, 339; *illus.*, 151.
Astbury Church, 136.
Astley Hall: gallery, 80.
Aston Hall, 42; staircase, 82, 84.
Astronomical ceiling at Theobalds, 81.
Athens, Antiquities of. *See* Stuart and Revett.
Atherton House, 200.
Atkinson, John, 28, 29.
Aubrey: on de Caux, 39; and Lambeth Great Hall, 324; and Wilton, 116, 118.
Audley End, 49, 50, 54, 109, 339; *plate*, 50; ceilings, 367, 377; chimney-stacks, 52; entrance porch, 35; gallery, 80; quadrangular plan, 70; *illus.*, 71; position of rooms, 276; B. Jansen and, 39, 51; Thorpe and, 42; Vanbrugh and, 199.
—— almshouses, 352.
Austin, Cornelius, 173, 330.
Avenue, Chestnut, Hampton Court, 176, 178.
Axwell Park, 258.

Babington, Master: and lead for Hampton Court, 378.
Bacon's essay, 90.
Bacon, Sir Nicholas: and foreign settlers at Sandwich, 32.
Baguley: half-timber building at, 325, *note.*
Bagutti: plaster work, 236, 239-241, 347, 376.
Baker, Christopher: and consumption of oak wood, 326.
Balcony, Kirby (*plate*), 120.
Balliol Chapel: windows, 34.
Banastre, Sir R.: and Passenham Church, 136.
Bandinelli, Baccio, 11.
Bank of England, old, 260.
Banqueting Hall: at Wilton, 118.
Banqueting House, The: Inigo Jones and, 402.
Barbaro, Daniel: on wealth of Henry VIII., 8, *note;* "Vitruvius," 25; and Italian architecture, 26; Fréart and, 303.
Barber Surgeons' Hall, 116, 314.
Barcheston, Flemish weavers at, 32.
Bardis, patronage of the, 26.
Barlborough Hall, 72, 76.
Barrington Court, 40 (*plate*); E-shaped plan of, 73.
Barry: and Harewood House, 262; and the College of Surgeons, 270.
Barsham, East: Head from frieze (*illus.*), 4; terra-cotta at, 5. *See* East.
Barthomley Church: new roof, 136.
Bartoli, Cosimo: Italian version of Alberti, 310.
Basil, Simon: succeeded by Inigo Jones, 106.
Basildon Park, 261.
Basing House, 116.
Bath: John Wood and son and Allen of, 248-250; masonry at, 337.
Bath stone: not used by Wren in London, 225; first used in London, 241; and Portland stone, 248, 334.
Baud, Reyner de, merchant, 10.
Bay-making, 32.
Beavor: half-timber houses at, 326, *note.*
—— House, 74.
Beckford, William, 288.
Bedford House, 130.
Bedingfield, Sir Edward: and Oxburgh Hall, 350.
Belcher and Macartney, 360.
Bell, Henry: life and works, 192-194, 152.
—— John, painter, 9.
Belsize, glassmaking at, 33.
Belvoir: plan, 284.
Benson: and Wren's dismissal, 185; Campbell and, 185, 218.
Bentley, J. and Michael, 57, 58.
Berkeley Square: Ware and, 244.
Bernardis, the, and Chichester, 19.
Bernini, 153, 233, 402.
Berwick-on-Tweed: mixture of styles in church, 146.

Bethlehem Asylum, 268.
—— Hospital, old, 254.
Bettes, James, and Hampton Court, 3.
Beverley: Sir C. Hotham's house at, 218.
—— Minster: Hawksmoor and, 208; part of gates (*illus.*), 390.
"Bibliotheca Radcliviana," 239, 240.
Biddenden: half-timber houses at, 326, *note*.
Birch, George: "London Churches of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," 156, 158, 166, 168; and St. Giles's, 246.
Bird, Thomas: figure carving at St. Paul's, 170.
Bishop-Auckland, 147.
Bishop's Burton, house at, 128.
Blacket, joiner, 213.
Blackheath: Sir G. Page's house (*plate*), 216; text, 216, 217.
Blashill on Abbey Dore, 63.
Blenheim Palace: elevation (*plate*), 194; plan (*plate*), 198; Vanbrugh and, 198, 199, 200, 286, 288; Hawksmoor and, 200, 202, 206; additions by Chambers, 264; masonry, 342.
Blickling: chimney-pieces, 36; staircase, 84; traditional style of, 339; brickwork, 352; ceilings, 367, 377.
Blithe, William: windows of Trinity Chapel, Camb., 34.
Blockley, locksmith, 240.
Blomfield and Thomas: "History of the Formal Garden in England," 229, 308, 383.
Bloome, Hans: treatise on the five orders, 88.
Bloomsbury, Alfred Place and Crescent, 270.
—— Square, No. 6, 244, 298.
—— the squares of: lead cisterns in, 380.
Board of Ordnance: and Roger Morris, 259.
Board of Works: and Taylor, 261.
Bodleian Library: rain-water head, 380.
Bodley, Sir Thomas: monument at Merton (*plate*), 38; Schools at Oxford, 54-58, 144.
Bold Hall: Leoni and, 228.
Bolsover Castle: the terrace (*plate*), 52; different styles, 53, 54; plan, 76; gallery, 80; gables of riding-school, 128; additional buildings, 131.
—— monuments at, 242.
Bolton, Duke of: and George I., 176.
Bonvisi, Antonio, 12.
Boord, Dr. Andrew: "A Boke" on building, 86.
Boreham Church: Sussex monument, 38.
Boughton Malherbe: plaster work, 81.
Bourbon, Catherine of: monument at Nymegen, 39.
Bowood, 270.
Bradford-on-Avon: details, 337.
Bramshill: brickwork, 352.
Bramham Park, 259.
Brancepath Church, 134.
Brandenburgh House, 259.
Brasenose Chapel, 146; *illus.*, 145.
—— College, 206.
Braun's, George, "Urbium Præcipuarum Mundi Theatrum quintum," 17.
Bray, Sir Reginald, 27.
Brecon market hall, 60.
Brent and Bodley, 57.
Brettingham, Matthew: and Lord Charlemont, 225; and Kedleston, 256; and Duke of York's palace, 297, 298; and Holkham, 313.
Brewer, "Calendar of State Papers," 3, 10, 12, 15, 27, 378. *See* Calendar.
Brick, gauged: Wren's treatment of, 172.
Brickwork: re-introduction and use, 348-362.
Bridgeman, and garden design, 232.
Bridges built by Paine, 258.
Bridgewater House: gallery, 301.
Bristol: Gibbs monuments at, 242.
—— Exchange, 249.
Britannic order, the, 275.
Britton, Godwin and: "Churches of London," 158, 161; and St. Paul's, 170.
Britton and Pugin: "Public Buildings of London," 228, 251, 264, 275; on the Brothers Adam, 272; on improvement in architecture, 319.
Britton's "Architectural Antiquities:" and East Barsham, 350.
Brocket Hall: central staircase, 258.
Brodrick, Dr., and Westminster dormitory, 226.
Broughton Castle: plaster work, 364.
Browne, Rawdon: "Calendar of Venetian State Papers," 8, 22, 33; on value of ducat, 8, *note*; on "mortuary" chests, 22.
Bruce, Sir William: and Hopetown House, 288.

Brunelleschi, 2.
Bruton Street: Ware and, 244.
Brympton, 120.
Buccleuch, Countess of: and Moor Park, 228.
Buckhurst House: plan, 42, 43, 70; *illus.*, 68.
Buckingham, Duke of: and old Buckingham House, 294.
Buckingham House, old, 149, 188, 190, 191, 192, 285, 286, 294; elevation (*plate*), 190; plan (*plate*), 294.
Buckland, Berks, 249, 250.
Builder-architects, 35, 138, 301, 338, 344-347.
Builder-designer: transition stage to architect, 51.
"Builder, The Practical," by W. Pain, 317.
Bullant, Fréart and, 303.
Burford Church: Tanfelde tomb, 38, 385.
—— Priory chapel (*illus.*), 143; described, 144.
Burges and Torrigiano, 10.
Burghers and the Ashmolean, 152, *note.*
Burghley House: foreman designer, 27, 28; building of, 31; and imported workmen, 34; German work at, 49; chimney-stacks, 52; plan, 70.
Burghley, Lord. *See* Cecil.
—— juxta Stamford, 42.
—— -on-the-Hill, 42.
Burleigh: ironwork, 387.
Burlington, Richard Boyle, Earl of: life and works, 223-229; and Whitehall drawings, 107; and Ford Abbey, 120; as architect, 208; house at Chiswick, 221, 224, 225; and Campbell, Ripley and Kent, 233; and Flitcroft, 244; and the Mansion House, 251, 260; collection of drawings, 285, 312; and the great folio publications, 307, 311.
Burlington Gardens: Duke of Queensberry's house in, 228; Ware and, 244.
Burlington House, old: remodelled, 130; new front and gateway, 218; elevation (*plate*), 218; colonnade, 224, 228.
Burrough, Sir James: life and works, 211.
Burton, Decimus, 403.
Burton, Agnes, 72, 339.
—— Park, 228.
Burwash: house at (*illus.*), 335; rubbed brickwork at, 356; plaster panel (*illus.*), 374.
Bury St. Edmunds: half-timber houses with spur, 325.
Bushey Park, 176, 196.
Bute, Lord: and Chambers, 263; and Luton House, 274.
Butleigh, 130.
"Byse" and gold at Hampton Court, 377.

Caister Castle: brickwork, 349, 350.
Caius, Dr. and Caius Coll., 36; his tomb, 36.
Caius College, Camb.: "porta honoris," 36; stone column with sundials, 36; the three-sided court, 72; Sir James Burrough and, 211.
Cale Hill: entrance to stables (*illus.*), 353.
"Calendar of State Papers": domestic, 31, 33, 34, 39, 50, 81, 134, 326, 378. *See also* Brewer.
"—— of Venetian State Papers." *See* Browne.
Camber Castle: brickwork, 351.
Cambridge: architects and others employed at, 58-60; amateurs at, 211, 212; builder-designers at, 67; colleges, 28, 30; college stairs, 75; Gibbs at, 238, 239, 312.
—— *See* separate buildings.
—— Senate House: elevation and interior (*2 plates*), 238.
Camden and the Forest of Dean, 326, 327.
Camfield, William: and Groombridge Church (*illus.*), 135.
Cammermayer, 35.
Campbell, Colin: life and works, 217-222, 214, 242; and Benson's house, 185; and Blenheim, 198; and old Buckingham House, 294; and Burlington House, 224; on Chatsworth, 194, 196; and Chiswick, 221, 224, 225; and Greenwich, 181; villa at Mereworth, 225, 285; on the Royal Exchange, 188; on Stoke Park, 285; and Wanstead, 246; "Vitruvius Britannicus," 106, 107, 307; and Lord Burlington, 225, 228, 233; and Gibbs, 233, 234, 241; Ware and, 313, 314; and Wren, 180, 185, 187, 215; and brickwork, 360; and lighting, 297; as author, 307, 308, 313.
—— Daniel: house at Shawfield, 218.

Campion, Thomas: masque by, 103.
Canons Ashby: staircase, 82; ceilings, 365.
Canterbury: brick house at, 361.
—— Burgate Street, panel (*illus.*), 25.
—— High Street: plaster panel, 368 (*illus.*), 369.
—— step gable in St. Dunstan's Street, 352.
Carew, Thomas: masque by, 103.
Carlisle Cathedral: fragment of screen, 393.
Carlow, Lord: and Gandon, 268.
Carmyan, Ellys, 15.
Carnarvon, Countess of: bedchamber ceiling (*plate*), 116.
"Carpenter, The Practical House," by W. Pain, 317.
Carpenters as architects, 60-66.
Carpentry: conditions of work and change of style in, 320-332.
Carr, of York: life and works, 261, 262; and Chambers, 252, 263; and Dance junr., 252; and Oakland House, 290, 297.
Carshalton Park: lead figure (2 *illus.*), 382, 383; gates and railings, 390, 392; Leoni and, 228.
Carter, Francis: and Inigo Jones, 99.
—— John: and house planning, 294.
Cartmell Church: repaired, 141, 142.
Cartwright, mason: and the Royal Exchange, 188.
—— Thomas: masque by, 103.
Carving in Butcher's Row, Hereford (*illus.*), 62.
Casement fastener, Guildford (*illus.*), 387.
Casino at Marino: plan (*illus.*), 265.
Casinos, design and purpose of, 263, 264.
Castell's, R.: "Villas of the Ancients," 229, 311.
Castle Ashby, 120.
—— Hill, 264.
—— Howard: elevations and plan (3 *plates*), 198, 200; Vanbrugh's plan, 198, 199, 286, 288; Hawksmoor and, 200; gallery, 300.
Castlemaine, Barbara, Lady, and Nonesuch Palace, 16.
Cataneo, Fréart and, 303.
Catherine of Bourbon: monument at Nymegen, 39.
Caux, Solomon de: work at Richmond, Wilton, etc., 39, 40; Inigo Jones carries out designs of, 99; and Wilton, 116-118.
Cavalcanti, John, merchant, 10.
Cavalcantis, patronage of the, 26.
Cavallari, Antonio, 12.
Cavalli, Venetian Ambassador in France, 26.
Cavendish's metrical "Life of Wolsey," 377.
—— Sir William: and Longleat, 364.
Cecil, Sir T.: house at Wimbledon, 42, 80.
—— Sir William: and Burghley (house), 27, 28, 31.
Ceiling in Chesterfield House: *plate*, 364; design for a (*plate*), 116; of Bishop West's Chapel (*plate*), 20; at Wilton (*illus.*), 105.
"Ceilings, Book of," Richardson's, 317.
Ceilings, decorated: at Theobalds, 81; by Paine, 259; in Wren's churches, 156, 161; various, 363-377 (4 *illus.*).
Cellars: position of, 278.
Cellini and Torrigiano, 10.
Chambers, Sir William: life and works, 262-268, 242, 244; and plaster work, 376; and the new school, 318; and the English tradition, 402; and Wilton, 117; and Carr and Dance junr., 252; and Gandon, 268, 269.
—— "Civil Architecture," 261, 265; publications and opinions, 316, 317.
—— Gwilt's life of, 260.
Chambord: stairs at, 284, *note*.
Chambray, Sieur de. *See* Fréart.
Chandos, Cassandra Willoughby, Duchess of: and Wollaton, 52.
Chapman, George; masque by, 103.
Chapter House Records, 226.
Charlecote, 31; gatehouse, 72.
Charlemont, Lord: casino at Marino, 261, 264; plan (*illus.*), 265.
Charles I.: and Whitehall, and Inigo Jones, 107-109; and Wilton, 116; and Gerbier, 132; mausoleum, 241.
Charles II. and Nonesuch Palace, 16; palace at Greenwich, 180.
Charles VIII., tomb, 9, *note*.
Charles Church, Plymouth, 146.
Charlton House, 72; gallery, 80; ceilings, 365.
Charterhouse, screens and mantelpieces of old, 35.
Charterhouse Chapel, old: Sutton's monument, 39.
Chastleton, 72.

Chatsworth: Talman, Campbell and, 194, 196; *plate*, 194; Paine and stables, 256; gallery, 301; inner court, 292; ironwork, 387.
—— drawings at, 107, 108.
Chavigny in Touraine, 304.
Cheere, Sir Henry, sculptor: and Taylor, 260.
—— John: lead yard in Piccadilly, 383.
Chelsea Church, old, chancel, 18; Dacre monument, 38.
—— Hospital: Wren and, 178, 180; Hawksmoor and Wren and, 200.
Chequers' Court, 72.
Chertsey, bridge at, 258.
Cheshire: manor houses of, 74; half-timber buildings, 60-66, 321, 325, 326.
Chester, Sir John: and Isleworth, 241.
Chesterfield House: Ware and, 243; plan (*illus.*), 245; ceiling (*plate*), 368.
Chests, "mortuary," 21, 22 (*illus.*).
Chevening: elevation and plan (*plate*), 280, (*text*), 280, 284.
Chichele: and Lambeth Great Hall, 324.
Chichester, house in West Street, 184; detail to house (*illus.*), 343; use of brick and stone, 358, 360.
—— Cathedral, pictures, etc., in, 19; Wren and, 178.
Chicksand, 243.
Child, Sir Richard: and Wanstead, 246.
Chilham: alterations by Taylor, 260.
Chimney-piece, Cobham (*plate*), 38; Wilton (*plate*), 116; sketch for, by Inigo Jones (*illus.*), 121. *See also* Mantelpiece.
Chimney-stacks: at Wollaton, etc., 52; introduction and use, 354-356; *illus.*, 355.
Chimneys: De l'Orme on, 92; Tuscan columns used as, 35.
Chiswick: drawings at, 97, 107, 113, 115, 117, 128, 130, 314, 371.
—— villa and casino, 221, 224, 225; gates, 390.
Christchurch, Hants., panels (*illus.*), 11, 323; chantry (*plates*), 18, 20; chapel, 19.
Christ Church, Newgate Street, 156, 160, 161, 162; font (*illus.*), 157.
—— Oxford, altar, 12; windows, 34; staircase to the hall, 146; gateway, 164; quadrangle, 70, 210; library, 210, 342; Clarke and, 206.
Christ Church, Spitalfields: elevation (*illus.*), 201; plan, 203 (*illus.*), 204.
Christ's College, Camb., 112, 212.
—— Hospital, 172, 357.
Christian IV. of Denmark: and Inigo Jones, 98, 99.
Chute, Chaloner: and the Vyne, 124.
Cibber, Caius: stone-carving, 170, 173, 178.
Circus, the, Bath, 249.
Cisterns, lead, 378, 380.
City churches: and Laud, 139; Wren's plans and rebuilding, 155-172.
—— Corporation, the: and George Dance, 250.
—— Halls, the: Wren and, 172.
Clandon, Surrey, 228.
Clare College, Cambridge: bridge and buildings, 344 (*plate*); doorway (*illus.*), 344; plaster work, 367; materials, etc., for, 28.
—— Chapel: Essex and, 212.
Clarendon Press Buildings, 206-208 (*plate*); gates, 387; masonry, 342.
Clark, Thomas and Charles, plasterers, 377.
Clarke, Dr.: and Christ Church, 206, 210, 211, 342.
Clarke, Willis and: Architectural History of the University of Cambridge. *See* Willis.
Clerisseau: Chambers and, 262.
Cliefden House, old: Wynne and, 188, 190, 191, 286; Archer and, 214.
Clock face, Rye Church (*plate*), 334.
Coap, Sir Walter: Thorpe and, 50.
Cobb's Hall: ceiling, 362.
Cobham, Henry, Lord, 39.
Cobham: chimney-pieces, 36, 38 (*plate*); monument, 38, 39; gateway (*illus.*), 59; Inigo Jones and, 120; position of rooms, 276.
Codington, Richard de, 16.
Colchester, colonies of Dutch and Flemish artisans at, 32.
Cole, B.: print of Wren's design for St. Paul's, 166.
Coleby Hall, 263.
Coleorton, 270.
Coleshill: staircase, 278; plan, 280, 284.
College buildings, seventeenth century, 75.
—— of Physicians, 121.
—— of Surgeons, 270.

Collegiate buildings, 70, *note*.
Collins, plasterer, 377.
Collyweston, slates from, 28.
Colour used in decoration, 81, 82.
Colte, and Elizabeth's monument, Westminster Abbey, 38.
Columella, villas described by, 311.
Compton: designed by Adam, 273.
Contracts for Cambridge Colleges, 28, 29.
Coom Bank, 259.
Coomb Abbey, 188, 192.
Cooper, Sir John: pavilion, 241.
Cope, Sir Walter: house at Kensington, 42, 45.
Copenhagen Bourse, 98, 112.
Copthall, 42.
Corpus College, Oxford, 210.
Corsham: stone doorhead at, 337; *illus.*, 338; school and almshouses (*illus.*), 65.
—— Court: and the E-shaped plan, 73; entrance to (*illus.*), 334.
Cosin, Bishop: and Bishop-Auckland, 147; and Peterhouse, 140.
Cottonian MSS.: survey of Theobalds Park, 50.
Courtyard house, 69.
Covent Garden: and Inigo Jones, 248; house in, 294.
Cowdray House, 19.
Cowick Hall, 256, 258.
Cranborne Manor: Inigo Jones and, 120; eaves, cornice, and quoins (*illus.*), 113.
Cranbrook: half-timber houses at, 326, *note*.
Crane, Sir Francis: and Stoke Park, 120.
Craven, Lord: and Hampstead Marshall, 132, 188.
Critz, John de, painter, 38.
Cromwell, Oliver: and Inigo Jones, 116; damage attributed to soldiery, 135.
—— Ralph, Lord: South Wingfield Manor House, 69.
—— Thomas, and Rovezzano, 12.
Cronenburg Castle, 98.
Crutched Friars, glassmaking at, 33.
Cunningham and Thorpe, 51.
Cupola to Hospital, Yarmouth, 333.
Cupolas, Wren's churches with, 157-160.
Currey Rivell: grille, 384, 385 (*illus.*).
Cusworth: alterations by Paine, 259.
Dacre monument, Chelsea, 38.
Dallaway: and Greenwich Hospital, 180.
Dance, George: life and works, 250-252; and his son, 269, 270.
Dance, George, the younger: life and works, 269-272; and Mansion House, 251; Chambers and Carr and, 252; and Taylor, 260.
Daniel: masque by, 103.
Davenant: masques by, 103.
Danvers, Lord: and Inigo Jones, 104.
Davaux: house in Paris, 304.
Decoration: Wotton on, 94.
Decorative architecture: Chambers on, 316, 317.
De l'Orme, 303.
De Pas, Henry: probable designs of Gresham's Exchange, 34.
Defoe: and Hampton Court, 178.
Demans, Demyans, etc. *See* Majano.
Denham, Sir John: and Webb, 130; and Wren, 152, 154.
Denmark Delineated, 98.
Deptford: church at, 216.
Derby House, 325, *note*.
—— Lord: house in Grosvenor Square, 273, 275.
Derbyshire, lead from, 28.
Desnoyers, Baron Dangu: and Fréart, 303.
Devall, plumber, 240.
Devon: half-timber work of, 64.
Devonshire, Duke of: collection of drawings, 100.
—— House, 231; gates, 390.
Dezalliers, D'Argenville: "Theory and Practice of Gardening," 216, 309.
Dictionary of Architecture, 132, 188, 248.
Dietterlin, Wendel: treatises, 88, 89; and Palladio, 35.
Digby, Lord: and Abel, 64.
Diocletian's Palace, 273.
Ditchley, 241; plan and elevation (*plate*), 240; and planning, 296; Gibbs's plates, 312.
Dixter, 354.
Domes: Wren's churches with, 157-160; of St. Paul's, 169, 170.
Domyngo, and Greenwich, 15.
Doncaster Mansion House, 254, 256.

Doorway: Clare College, 344: Kirby (*plate*), 120; Queen Street, King's Lynn, 193 (*illus.*), 194; Rushton (*illus.*), 47; Tenterden (*plate*), 34; at the Vyne (*illus.*), 125.
Dorchester: tombstone (*illus.*), 347.
Dorset, Earl of: and Knole, 43.
Dover House, 256.
—— Street: Ware and, 244.
Dowsing, W., iconoclast: and Peterhouse Chapel, 140.
Drake: "Eboracum," 1736, 226.
Drapers' Hall: Jerman and, 187.
Drayton: Webb and, 124.
Dublin: public buildings, 268, 269; Custom House (*plate*), 268.
Dubois, Nicholas, French translation of Palladio, 309, 310.
Ducat, value of, 8, *note*.
Dudingstone, 264.
Duncombe: and Shire Hall, Hereford, 62.
—— Park, 290, 288, 289, 290.
Durham House: Inigo Jones and, 120.
Dutch in England, 25; influence on architecture, 33.
—— architecture: Wren and, 187.
—— clinkers, 351.
Dynham House: Talman and, 196.

E-shaped plan, 72-75.
Eagle House, Bathford, 248.
East Barsham Manor House: brickwork and terra-cotta, 350; chimney stack, 354, 355 (*illus.*). *See* Barsham.
East Grinstead: lead cistern at, 379 (*illus.*), 380.
Eastbury, 199.
Easton Neston House (*plate*), 202.
Eastwell: plan, 291.
Edinburgh: Record Office, 273, 274.
—— University: Adam's designs, 273.
Edward I. and III.: and the Flemings, 348.
Edward VI., 18, 25, 26, 31, 33, 133, 326.
Egyptian Hall, 226.
Elizabeth, 16, 25-41, 32, 33, 38, 133, 134, 319, 329, 330, 332, 336.
Elmes: and Wren's city halls, 172.
Eltham Club House: plans (*illus.*), 283; description, 284, 184.
—— Palace: Thorpe's plan, 50.
Ely: Chapter House, 400.
—— Bp. West's chapel, 20; ceiling (*plate*), 20; plaster work, 364; iron gates, 384.
—— Matthew Wren, Bishop of, 149, 152.
—— House, 260.
Emmanuel College: Simons and, 58, 60; Essex and, 212; *plate*, 154; brickwork, 351.
Emmanuel Hospital, 184; brickwork, 358.
Entasis: Wotton on, 92; Alberti's misunderstanding, 92.
Essex, half-timber building in, 321, 326, 327, 328; brickwork in, 350, 352.
Essex, James: life and works, 212; and Rev. Robert Masters, 208, 212.
Esterfelde, Master, 9.
Evelyn: glossary and translations, 303, 304; on Nonesuch Palace, 17; and Wren, 150, 152.
Exchange, the new, London, 172.
Exeter College: the old and new chapel, 58; hall, 327.
Ewer, Nicholas, coppersmith and gilder, 9.

Façade at Prior Park, 249.
Faithorne: at Basing House, 116.
Faulkbourn Hall: brickwork, 348.
Feldborg, Andersen: and Inigo Jones, 98.
Fell, Dean: and Christ Church, 146.
Fenwicke, Colonel: and Berwick-on-Tweed, 146.
Fergusson, James: and Wren's design of St. Stephen's, 158; and St. Paul's, 166; and St. Martin's, 236, 238; on Newgate and Mansion House, 270.
Finchcox, house at: planning, 294, 296.
Finsbury Square: Dance junr. and, 270.
Fishmongers' Hall, 187.
Fishpond houses, old: plaster work on (*illus.*), 369.
Fitzroy Square: the Adams and, 274, 275; stucco, 273, 376.
Fitzwilliam, Lord: and Milton House, 241.
Flemings in England, 25-39; influence on English builders, 64; and re-introduction of brickwork, 348-351.
Flemish ironwork, 384; work at St. John's, Oxford, 112; workmen in England, 25-39.
Flint and stone, use of, 48.

Flitcroft, life and works, 242, 244, 246; succeeded by Chambers, 263; and Woburn, 292; and Wentworth House, 261, 313.
Florentine, Nicholas, 15.
Font, Christchurch, Newgate Street (*illus.*), 157; St. Stephen's, Walbrook (*illus.*), 171.
Fontana: studied by Inigo Jones, 105.
—— C., the younger: and Gibbs, 233.
Fonthill: plan, 288.
Foots Cray Place, 221.
Forcet: Paine and, 259.
Ford Abbey, 120; ceiling, 370.
Foreign traders settled in Sandwich, 32.
Foremark, 260.
Forest of Dean: half-timber building in, 321, 327.
Fortuna Virilis, temple of, 303.
Foundations, rules for, 92.
Fountains in lead, 378.
Fountains Hall, 74; staircases, 82.
Fourdrinier, 244; re-engraver of old plates, 311; reproductions of Palladio, 311.
Francini's "Livre d'Architecture," translated by Pricke, 304.
Francis I.: on the gilding in Henry VIII.'s palaces, 81.
Fraunceis John, merchant, 10.
Fréart, Roland: Dubois and, 310; "Parallels," 303, 304.
Fredericksborg: and Inigo Jones, 98.
French architecture: Wren and, 187.
—— artists and Nonesuch Palace, 17, 18.
—— decorators: influence on Wren, 153, 162.
—— and English Art, 399, 400.
—— Renaissance art at Carlisle, 393.
Friend, Dr., and Westminster dormitory, 226.
Frieze: coloured plaster work at Hardwicke Hall, 82, 362, 364.
Frogley, Richard, carpenter, 152, *note*.
Fulmer Church, 134.

Gables, corbie step and other, 352, 354.
Galleries, long: of inns, 75; of Elizabethan and other houses, 78-80; in Wren's churches, 160, 161.
Gallery in Mr. Windham's house, 259, 260.
—— the great: position of, 276; survival, 278, 300, 301.
Gandon, James: life and works, 268, 269; on Stuart's Athens, 262.
—— Life of, by Mulvany, 262.
—— Woolfe and. *See* Woolfe.
Garden architecture, 216.
—— the Formal, 383.
—— design: Langley on, 316; Kent's influence on, 229, 232.
—— house (*illus.*), 77.
—— and house: connection between, 308, 309.
Gardeners, landscape: and brickwork, 360.
"Gardening, Theory and Practice of." By John James, 216.
Gardens: lead vases and figures in, 381, 382.
Gardiner's chantry, screen to (*illus.*), 20.
Gardiner, Starkie: and Tijou, 386, 387.
Gatehouses, 69, 72.
Gates, details of (*illus.*), 177.
Gateway: Cobham College (*illus.*), 59; Montacute House (*plate*), 22; sixteenth century, Wilton, 117.
Gay Street, Bath: Wood junr. and, 249.
Gayton Manor House, 78.
Gent: and Bodley, 57.
"Gentleman's Exercise," Peacham, 51.
—— Magazine, 294.
"George" Inn: long galleries of, 75.
George I.: and Winchester palace, 176; and Wren, 184; and Westminster dormitory, 226.
George II.: lodge in Richmond Park, 259.
George III., vault of, 14; and Greenwich Hospital, 182; and Chambers, 263.
Geographical designs at Theobalds, 81.
Gerbier, Sir B.: life and works, 132; and the Civil War, 149; and Wynne, 188, 190.
German art: influence of, 40.
—— designers: and Inigo Jones, 121.
—— influence in plaster work, 364, 366-370.
—— pattern books and treatises, 88.
Germans in England, 25-41; and Longford Castle, 49; and Burghley, 49.
Gibbons, Grinling, 128, 170, 173, 178, 330, 374.
Gibbs, James: life and works, 233-242; house planning, 296; methods of lighting, 297; plaster work, 376; porticoes, 110; height of rooms and galleries, 298, 300; Campbell and, 308; and Flitcroft, 246;

Gibbs, James—*continued.*
and Hawksmoor, 202; and Inigo Jones, 252; Ware and, 314; and Wren, 187; "Book of Architecture," 297, 300, 312; other architectural works, 312, 313.
Gibside: buildings at, 259.
Gidde, Walter: "Booke of Sundry Draughts," 90.
Giustiniani, Sebastian, and the wealth of Henry VIII., 7, *note.*
Glass and glass-workers, 33, 34.
Glass-workers, Italian and Flemish, 33.
Glastonbury, Flemish weavers at, 32.
—— Abbey: damage to monuments, 134, 135.
Godalming: brickwork at, 356.
Godinton, 72; staircase, 82, 84.
Godwin and Britton: "Churches of London," 158, 161; and St. Paul's, 170.
Goldsmiths' work, 8.
Goodwood, 222, 288.
Gopsall Hall, 260.
Gorges, Sir Thomas: and Longford Castle, 36, 48, 49.
—— Lady: and Longford Castle, 48, 49.
Gosforth House: ground plan (*illus.*), 255; Paine and, 256, 258, 259.
Gossford House, 274.
Gotch, J. Alfred: "Architecture of the Renaissance in England," 43; "Buildings of Sir Thomas Tresham," 48; and Bolsover, 53, 76; and gables at Bourne Pond, 352; and Cobham, 39, 120; on Kirby, 340; on buildings in Northamptonshire, 334; and St. John's, Oxford, 112; and Wollaton, 52; and plaster work, 367, 372.
Gothic: Inigo Jones's work in, 106; Wren and, 164, 168, 186; at Inverary Castle, 259; seventeenth century, 146-148; eighteenth century, 147, 148; tradition in masonry, 137; woodwork, 322-327; tradition at Oxford, 144; King James's Gothic, 100; and the Reformation, 132-135; English-Gothic, 66, 117, 138, 206, 231, 232, 262, 360, 400, 401, 403.
Gower, Lord: houses in Whitehall, 264.
Grange, the, in Hampshire, 120.
Great Cressingham Priory: brickwork, 350.
Great Snoring Rectory: brickwork and terra-cotta, 349 (*illus.*), 350. *See* Snoring.
Great Queen Street: brickwork, 123, 356.
Greek architecture, 252, 262, 342, 397; R. Adam and, 275; Chambers on, 316, 317.
Green Park: Ranger's House, 273.
Greenwich Hospital, 180-182; plan (*plate*), 180; elevation (*plates*), 182; *illus.*, 111; Webb and Jones's designs, 115, 130-133; part of ceiling (*illus.*), 131, 371; mantelpiece (*illus.*), 133; banqueting house, 15, 27; interior of chapel rebuilt, 262; Queen Mary's block, 223; Hawksmoor and, 200; I. Jones and, 115, 130-133, 314; Vanbrugh and, 198; Ware and, 243; Webb and, 115, 123, 130-133; 314.
—— Queen's House, 114, 115, 180, 181, 280.
Gresham, Sir Richard: buys tapestry for Wolsey, 7.
—— Sir Thomas: College, 150, 187; Exchange, 34, 35; materials and workmen, 31, 34.
Grimsthorpe: Vanbrugh and, 198, 199; inner court, 292.
Grimthorpe, Lord: Lincoln's Inn Chapel and, 106.
Groombridge, Kent: elevation (*illus.*), 183; plan (*illus.*), 184; use of brick and stone, 358.
—— Church: south porch (*illus.*), 135.
Grosvenor Square: Lord Derby's house, 273, 275.
Grumbold, Robert: life and works, 344; and Clare College, 28, 52, 67; and St. Catherine's Hall, 29.
—— Thomas: life and works, 67, 344.
Guildford: ironwork of house, 386; *illus.*, 387; Abbot's Hospital, 5; Town Hall, 330.
Gunnersbury, 120, 123, 130, 284.
Gwilt: life of Sir Wm. Chambers, 260, 263; on Paine, Taylor, and Adam, 260, 261.

H-shaped plan, 74, 75.
Haberdasher's Hall, 187.
Hacket, Bishop: work at Lichfield, 147.
Hackwood, 176, 241.
Haddon Hall: earlier part of, 69; and Queen's College, 70, *note;* gallery, 80, 365; rain-water heads, 380.
Hadleigh: Flemings at, 348.
Halfpenny, William: publications, 316.
Hall, the: uses of, 78.

Halls, studied as models for the Hall, Trin. Coll., Camb., 30.
—— the City: Wren and, 172.
Halsted: petitions for Dutchmen, 32.
Hammersmith: Thos. Wyndham's house at, 259, 260.
Hampshire, Italians in, 21, 23.
Hampstead: entrance gate to churchyard, 392.
Hamptead Marshall, 188-190, 192, 132; pier (*illus.*), 189; urn on gate pier (*illus.*), 404.
Hampton Court: transformed by Wolsey, 3; *plate*, 184; the architect, 27; materials, 27; Wren's design, 176, 292; alterations of William III., 196; Nunziata and, 15; Francis I. and the gilding, 81; bricks, 348, 349, 350; lead work, 377, 378, 380, 381; panelling, 332; terra-cotta roundel (*plate*), 2; chapel fittings broken up, 10; chimney-stacks, 354; courtyard, 173; long gallery, 79; gates, 172; *illus.*, 177, 387; gate-house, 69; hall, 23; roof of hall 322, 323, 324; north-east corner (*illus.*), 175; screens, 387.
Handicrafts connected with architecture, 320-347.
Hanley Church, 147.
Hannes, Sir Edward: and Westminster dormitory, 226.
Hanover Square: the Adams and, 273; Ware and, 244.
Hardwicke Hall: gallery, 80; the presence chamber (*plate*), 364; lead figures, 383; masonry, 340; coloured plaster work, 82; tapestries, 82; plaster friezes, 362, 364.
Hare Hall: entablature, 259.
Harewood House: designed by Carr, 261, 262; altered by Barry, 262 (*plate*).
Harewood Place: corner house, 273.
Harlow, Sir Robert, 10.
Harris, engraver, 313.
Harrison, on supply of building stones, 34.
—— Frederic: Annals of an old Manor House, 69.
—— John: and St. John's, Leeds, 136, 137.
Hart Street: Ware and, 244.
Harwood, Dr.: and Inigo Jones, 97.
Hatfield: brickwork, 352; chimney-pieces, 36; the gallery, 300; screens and mantle-pieces, 35; staircase, 82, 84; terra-cotta, 5.
Hatton, Sir Christopher: and Kirby, 43.
—— and Lindsay House, 116.
Hawkhurst: staircase (*illus.*), 93.
Hawksmoor, Nicholas: life and works, 200-208; and designing, 173, 184; designs in "Vitruvius Britannicus," 308; and Greenwich Hospital, 181; and King's, Cambridge, 239; drawing of St. Mary-le-bow, 161; and Archer's style, 215; Gibbs and, 239, 241; James and, 216; Kent compared with, 232; and Vanbrugh, 187, 197, 200; 110, 342, 402.
Haveus, Theodore, of Cleves: and Caius Coll., Camb., 36.
Hawley, Principal: and Bodley, 57.
Haydocke, Richard: translation of Lomazzo's treatise, 88.
Headcorn: half-timber houses at, 326, *note*; introduction of chimney-stacks at, 354.
Heath House, 256.
Heathfield: stucco, 360.
Heberden's, Dr., house in Pall Mall, plan (*illus.*), 299.
Hechstetten, Daniel: indenture with Elizabeth, for mining, 33.
Heidelberg: De Caux's work at, 39.
Henchman, Bishop of London: and St. Paul's, 170.
Henry, Prince: and De Caux, 39.
Henry VII.: tomb, 8, 9, 384; chapel, 9, 10.
Henry VIII.: and the Renaissance, 393, 394; and Camber Castle, 351; hall at Hampton Court, 23; Nonesuch Palace, 16, 17; and imported workmen, 3, 362, 364; brickwork freely used, 352; and lead work, 378, 380; and Sir Thomas Phelips, 73; and Sir R. Weston, 350; Francis I. on his houses, 81; Venetian admiration for the rooms in his palaces, 82; tomb, 10; wealth, 7, *note*.
Heraldic bearings emblazoned in full, 81.
Herbert, George: and Church of Leighton-Bromswould, 136.
—— Sir William, 19.
Hereford: Shire Hall, 60, 62; carving in Butcher's Row (*illus.*), 62; mills at, 64.
Herefordshire: half-timber style, 60-66; woodwork, 330.
Heriot's Hospital, 98, 112.
Hertford: plaster work on house at, 369.
—— monument, Salisbury, 38 (*plate*).

Heveringham Hall, 260.
Heylyn, P.: "Cypriacus Anglicanus," 110.
Heythrop House, 214, 288.
Heywood: masque by, 103.
Higgins, Alfred, on Florentine sculptors, 8, 9, 11, 14.
Higham Ferrers Church, 136.
Hiorns, the: buildings designed by, 260.
Hoefnagle's print of Nonesuch Palace, 17.
Holbein, Hans, 15, 18, 19, 320.
Holdenby, 42, 43, 44, 45.
Holkham Hall: Kent and, 230, 231; elevation and plan (2 *plates*), 228, 230; gallery, 301; planning, 290.
Holland House, 42, 43, 45, 50, 51; plan (*illus.*), 73, 74.
Hollar: at Basing House, 116; two views of Gresham's Exchange, 34; view of old St. Paul's, 113.
Holt, Thomas: life and works, 54-58; at Oxford, 330.
Hoone, Galyon, glazier of Southwark, 33.
Hopetown House, 288, 297.
Horne, Herbert: and the Italians in England, 21; on Inigo Jones, 97, 99, 100, 106, 109, 116, 121; and the Royal Exchange, 188.
Horse Guards, the: Kent and, 231; *plate*, 232; Vardy and, 247.
Horseheath Hall, 130.
Horsham slates: and form of roof, 336.
Hotham, Sir Charles: house at Beverley, 218.
Houghton Hall: plan, 220, 222; *plate*, 220; Ware plates of, 242, 313; ceilings, 230.
Howe, Lord: and Gopsall Hall, 260.
Hulsbergh, engraver, 244, 311, 313.
Humfrey, paymaster of the Mint, authorized to mine, 33.
Hunsdon, Carey, Lord: monument at Westminster, 38.
Hurstmonceux: brickwork, 350, 351.
Hyde Park: plans for barracks, 184; Leoni and triumphal arch, 228.

Iffley: archway of, 399.
Inderwick, F. A.: "Inner Temple Records," 5.
Inns, old: long galleries of, 75.
Inverary Castle: Morris and, 259.
Iron, cast: used in place of lead, 377.
—— mills and consumption of wood, 326, 327.
Ironwork: history and use, 384-392; of screens, St. Paul's, and gates of Hampton Court, 172.
Isleworth: Sir J. Chester's house, 241.
Italian artists, 22, 23, 33, 40, 62, 64, 66, 70, 77, 100, 102, 103, 298.
—— merchants at Winchester, 21.

Jackson's "History of Wadham College," 34, 58, 145.
Jackson, Canon: "History of Longleat," 53.
James, Dr., Bodley's librarian, 57.
James, John: life and works, 214, 216, 217; and Cambridge, 239; and Queen Anne's churches, 202; and porticoes, 110; and Gibbs, 241; and I. Jones, 252; designs in "Vitruvius Britannicus," 308; translations, 308, 309.
Janssen, Bernard, 39; Audley End, 51.
Jarman (or Jerman), Edward, 187, 172.
Jennings, Richard, chief carpenter of St. Paul's, 170, 216.
—— Robert, mason, 9.
Jersey, Thomas: and Paine, 254.
Jesus College; Holt and, 58; brickwork in gateway, 351.
—— Chapel: east window, 146.
Jewit: and Wadham College, 144.
Johnson, Mr. Secretary: and Twickenham, 241.
Jones, Inigo: life and works, 97-122; "Stonehenge Restored," 124; notes on Palladio, 310; and architectural literature, 302, 339, 398, 402; "Some designs by Mr. Inigo Jones and Mr. W. Kent," 231, 243, 244, 311, 312; designs published by Ware, 242, 313, 314; designs in "Vitruvius Britannicus," 308; and house planning, 276-286; and Covent Garden, 248; and Greenwich, 180; and Gunnersbury, 130; and Kirby, 340; houses in Lincoln's Inn, 172; and St. Alban's, 139; and old Somerset House, 18; and Stoke Park, 190; and Wilton, 39, 198; and West Woodhay, 362; and masons, 342; and plaster work, 82, 364, 370, 372; woodwork, 332; supersedes De Caux, 39; and Chambers, 267; and Gerbier, 132; and Marsh, 131, 133; Sancroft and, 164; and Webb, 117-131; and Wren, 132, 149, 162.

Jonson, Ben: "Tale of a Tub," 89, 98; masques, 98, 100, 102; list, 103; and Inigo Jones, 104, 398.
Jugg, Miles: windows of Trinity Chapel, Cambridge, 34.
Juxon, Archbishop: and Lambeth Great Hall, 324.

Kauffmann, Angelica, 82.
Kedleston, 256; elevation, section and plan (3 *plates*), 256; Paine and Adam, 273, 290, 297.
Kemp, Peter: and Burghley, 31.
Kensington Palace: Wren and, 178; entrance (*illus.*), 179; brickwork, 358; ceilings, 230.
Kent: consumption of oak wood in, 326.
—— east: gables, 352; masonry, 337.
—— the Weald of: introduction of chimney-stacks, 354; foreign settlements in, 32; half-timber buildings, 321, 325, 326; timber work, 64; yeoman's houses, 74, 75.
Kent, William: life and works, 229-232; and Chiswick villa, 225; succeeded by Flitcroft, 244; and Gibbs, 233; and Ripley, 182, 220, 222, 223; and John Vardy, 247; Walpole and, 221; publication of designs and drawings by Inigo Jones and others, 107, 225, 228, 242, 243, 246, 284-286, 311-314.
Kenwood House, 273; section (*plate*), 276; designs published, 318; stucco, 377.
Ketton, stone from, 28.
Kew Bridge, 258 (*plate*).
—— Gardens: pagodas at, 263.
King's Bench, Court of, 247, 248.
—— Bench Walk: brickwork, 358.
King's College, Cambridge: design, 206; new buildings, 239; *plate*, 240; designer, etc., of windows, 33.
—— Chapel, 212, 400.
—— Hall, 199.
King's Lynn: buildings, etc., by Bell, 192-194; Custom House (*plate*), 192; doorway and house in Queen Street (*illus.*), 193, 194; ironwork at, 392; masonry of the Guildhall, 337; half-timber houses with spur, 325.
King's Road, Chelsea, house in, 228.
—— Weston, 199.
Kington market hall, 60.
Kip's view of Somerset House, 115.
Kirby, Northamptonshire: Thorpe and, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 51; *plate*, 46; quadrangular plan, 70; doorway and balcony (*plate*), 120; chimney-stacks, 49; and Inigo Jones, 120.
—— Hall, Yorkshire, 259, 261; internal communication, 76.
Kirkall, engraver, 313.
Kirtlington, 260.
Knole: and Thorpe, 43, 45; *plate*, 44; ceiling in long gallery, 364, 365; chimney-pieces, 36-37; colonnade (*illus.*), 329; gable (*illus.*), 44; rain-water head at, 380.
Kyp's "Britannia Illustrata," 130, 188.

Labacco, 105.
Laguerre, 82.
Lake House, 3; masonry, 337.
Lamberhurst: introduction of chimney-stacks, 354.
Lambeth Palace Library: roof, 322, 324.
Lamport Hall, 130.
Lancashire: half-timber style of, 60-66, 321, 325, 326; manor houses, 74.
Laneborough House, 243.
Langley, Batty: publications, 316.
Lanhydrock: gatehouse, 72; masonry, 337.
Lannoy, Cornelius de, glass works under, 33.
Lansdowne House, 273, 274.
Larke, Thomas, glazier, of Southwark, 33.
Latham Hall: plan, 288, 289 (*illus.*).
Lathom House, 228.
Laud, Archbishop: and the building of churches, 136; and St. John's, Oxford, 110; and St. Catherine Cree, 112; and old St. Paul's, 112; his impeachment, 138.
Lavenham: half-timber house with spur, 325.
—— Guildhall, 330.
Law's, Ernest, "History of Hampton Court," 3, 7, 16, 377; on money values in Henry VIII.'s time, 323.
Layer Marney, 69; brickwork, 350; terra-cotta, 5.
Le Blond: "Theory and Practice of Gardening," 216, 309.
Le Muet's "Manière de bien Bastir," translated by Pricke, 304; translation of Palladio, Bk., I., 310; on doors, windows, etc., 303.
Lead work, 377-383.

Lebuis, John, mason, 9.
Ledbury market hall, 329; *illus.*, 331.
Lee, Sir Henry: and Quarendon Church, 134.
Leeds, St. John's, 136-138.
Leighton-Bromswould Church, 136.
Leimpster's, Lord, house, 202.
Lenham: half-timber houses at, 326, *note*.
Lennox, Duke of, 100.
Lenôtre: and his school, 216; system of design in gardens, 309.
Lenthall, Speaker: and Burford Priory, 144.
Leominster Church: rain-water head, 380.
—— the Grange (*illus.*), 63.
—— market hall, 60, 62, 63.
—— Town Hall, 330.
Leoni, Giacomo: life and works, 226, 228; translations of Palladio and Alberti, 309, 310; and Burlington House, 224; and Carshalton, 392; and Latham Hall, 288; and Inigo Jones's notes, 302.
Lesueur: and St. John's, Oxford, 112.
Lethaby: on lead work, 378, 380, 383.
Leybourne: revised edition of Primatt's "City and Country Purchaser and Builder," 300, 305; "The Mirror of Architecture," 305.
Liardet: patent stucco, 376.
Licences to search for treasures in abbeys, etc., 134.
Lichfield: Bishop Hacket's work at, 147.
Lightoler: Morris, Halfpenny and, 316.
Lincoln College: quadrangular plan, 69.
—— College Chapel: windows, 34; tracery, 146.
Lincoln's Inn Chapel, 106.
Lincoln's Inn Fields, 106, 172; Lindsay House, 116; houses on west side, 339; streets west of, 317.
Lindsay House: 106, 116; plan, 280-282; *illus.*, 281.
Linel of Long Acre, woodcarver, 240.
Litchfield, Lord: and Ditchley, 241; house, 296.
Little Wenham Hall: brickwork, 348.
Littlecote, 40, 54, 339; ceiling in hall, 366; staircase, 82.
Liverpool Exchange, 249.
Lloyd, Sir Nathaniel: and lead figures, Trinity Hall garden, 383.
Loftie: and St. Paul's, 166, 167, 170; and portico of St. Paul's, Covent Garden, 110; on Lord Burlington, 223, 224; and Wood, 248; "I. Jones and C. Wren," 108; and Wren's designs, 156.
Lomazzo's treatise: Haydocke's translation, 88.
London: the Great Fire, 154; Wren's plans and re-building, 154-172; *double plate*, 154-5.
—— Bridge, old: Hawksmoor and, 208, 260.
—— Public Buildings of: Britton and Pugin, 264.
Lyme Hall, 228.
Lytham Hall, 261.
Long, Geo., iconoclast: and Peterhouse Chapel, 140.
Long Acre: streets near, 317.
Longford Castle: 36, 42, 45, 48, 49, 77, 337; Thorpe and drawings for, 51.
Longleat, Wiltshire, 18, 30, 31, 35; Smithson and, 53; Canon Jackson's History of, 53; C. Williams, plasterer, and, 364.
Longman: "Three Cathedrals dedicated to St. Paul," 122, 166, 167, 170.
Lorenzo, Antonio di Piergiovanni di, sculptor, 11.
Loseley, 36, 42.
Losely MSS., 15.
Louis XIV., architects of: Wren and, 372.
Louvre: the building of the, 153.
Luton House: 273, 274; elevation (*plate*), 274; designs published, 318.
Lysons: and Greenwich Hospital, 180.
Lytes-Cary: ceiling, 366; the chapel (*illus.*), 141; described, 137, 142.
Lyveden, 45, 46, 48; new building, 78.

Macartney, Belcher and, 360.
Magdalen College, Oxford, 70.
Maiden Bradley: plan, 292; (*illus.*), 290; (*plate*), 290.
Maidenhead Bridge, 261.
Maidstone: plaster work in Bank Street, 369.
Majano, Giovanni da, 11, 13, 15; and terra-cotta, 3.
—— Girolamo and Benedetto di Nardo da, 12.
Mansard: plans, etc., by, 304; Wren and, 402.

Mansfield Street: the Adams and, 273.
Mansion House: George Dance and, 250 (*plate*), 251; Fergusson on, 270; Taylor and 260.
Mapledurham: chimney-stacks, 354.
Mapperton: view of (*illus.*), 320.
Mar, Lord: and Gibbs, 233.
Marcellus, theatre of: Fréart and, 303.
Marino: Lord Charlemont's Casino at, 261, 264; plan (*illus.*), 265.
Market Cross at King's Lynn, 194.
Market halls: half-timber style, 60-66.
Marlborough, Duchess of: and Old Wimbledon House, 80.
—— House, 182; planning, 292, 304.
Marney, Lord Henry, 5.
Marsh, architect: works, 131, 132.
Mary, Queen of Scots: monument, Westminster, 38.
Marylebone Chapel: Gibbs's plates, 312.
Mason, the: and abundance of good building stone, 321.
—— architects, 344.
—— church-designers, 138.
—— and sculptor, 321.
Masonry: conditions of work and change of style in, 321, 332-347; in Yorkshire, 60.
Masons, highly trained, 203.
Masques at Court: Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones, 98, 99, 100, 102; list of, 103.
Masters, Rev. Robert: and Essex, 208, 212.
Mauclerc's, J., "Le Premier Livre d'Architecture," 304.
Maynard, John, painter, 9.
Mazzoni, Guido, of Modena, 9.
Meare: fishing house at, 74; plan (*illus.*), 75.
Mediæval craftsmen: and the individual ideal, 176.
—— tradition in woodwork, 322-326.
Melbourne: lead rain-water head and vases (*illus.*), 381; lead figures, 383.
—— Lord: houses in Piccadilly, 264.
Merchant Taylors' Company: and St. Peter's, Wolverhampton, 134.
—— Taylor's Hall, 187.
Mereworth: Campbell's villa at, 225, 285.
—— Castle, 220, 221; section (*plate*), 226.
Merton College: Bodley's monument (*plate*), 38.
Merton College Library, 58.
Metal workers: Elizabeth imports Germans, 33. *See* Iron.
Micklethwaite, 9, *note*.
Middle Temple: brickwork, 358.
—— Temple Hall: model for the Great Hall, Trin. Coll., Camb., 30; roof, 322, 323, 324.
Milanesi on Torrigiano, 11.
Millar, W.: "Plastering," 362.
Mills, City Surveyor, and the City Halls, 172, 188.
Milton House: Gibbs and, 241, 312.
Mistley Church, 273.
Mocenigo, Lionardo: Palladio and, 290.
Money values in time of Henry VIII., 323.
Monmouth, Duke of: and Moor Park, 228.
Monogram House, Thorpe's, 45.
Montacute House: panel above entrance porch, 40; entrance front, 40; E or H plan of, 75; gallery, 80; gateway (*plate*), 22.
Montague Grove, Hampstead: Flitcroft and, 246.
—— House, old, 182, 286.
Montgomery, Lord: and the masques at Court, 100.
Monument, the, 172.
—— design for a (*plate*), 186.
Moor Park (*plate*), 228; plan (*illus.*), 287, 288.
Morden College: and Wren, 184.
More Chantry, 18.
Moreton Hall: gallery, 80.
Morley: and palace of Wolvesey, 174.
Morris, Robert: life and works, 259, 260, 315, 316; and bridge at Wilton, 229, 260.
—— Roger, engineer, 259.
Mortimer, "brawderer," 8.
Morton Old Hall, 325, *note*.
"Mortuary" chests, 21, 22 (*illus.*).
Moulsham, 228.
Muchelney: priest's house at, 74.
Mulvany: "Life of Gandon," 262.
Mymms, North, 51; and the E-shaped plan, 73.
Mynde, engraver, 313.

Nantwich Church: galleries added, 136.
Nash, 403; R. Adam and, 275.

Neill, Archbishop: and St. John's, Leeds, 136.
Nelson's tomb, 14.
Netherlands: and brickwork, 348. *See* Dutch, Flemish.
Neville, Dr., additions to Trin. Coll., Camb., 29; Simons and, 58, 60.
New Assembly Rooms, Bath, 249.
New College, Oxford: Wykeham's buildings, 69.
Newark Town Hall, 261.
Newbury High Street: brickwork, 356.
Newby, Yorks., 218.
Newcastle, Duke of: Gibbs's monument, 242.
—— House, 188; plan, 191 (*illus.*), 192, 294.
Newels, carved, 82, 84.
Newgate Prison, 269, 270-272; entrance (*illus.*), 271.
Niche, Peterhouse chapel (*illus.*), 139.
Niello, lavish use of, in Cobham monument, 39.
Nobleman's house, sixteenth century, 70-72.
Nonesuch Palace, 16 (*plate*), 17; gatehouse, 69; plaster work, 362, 367.
Norfolk: brickwork, 350, 352; gables, 352.
—— churches: frescoes and screens, 321.
—— Duke of: house in the Strand, 182; and Worksop Manor House, 256.
Norman and Saxon art, 399.
North Runcton Church, 194, 195 (*illus.*).
Northamptonshire: buildings, 78, 334.
Northiam Church: altar-piece, 136.
Northumberland, Duke of: sends Shute to Italy, 86.
—— House: B. Jansen and, 39; Webb and, 128.
Nostell Priory, 254, 290, 291.
Notre Dame: and Salisbury, 400.
Nottingham: Mr. Plumptre's house, 218.
—— Castle, 131.
—— County Hall and Prison, 268.
Nunziata, Toto del, painter, 7, 11, 15, 16.
Nymegen, Groote Kirk of: monument of Catherine of Bourbon, 39.

Oakland House, 290, 297.
Oatlands Park: gateway, 110.
Ogle, C.: and Twickenham, 241.
Orchard Street: Ware and, 244.
Orders, the: Richardson's treatise on, 317; Wotton on, 92.
Oriel College, 56 (*plate*), 58; tracery, 156.
Oriel windows: position of, 80.
Orme, Philibert de l', rules for foundations, etc., 92; studied by Inigo Jones, 105.
Osmaston Hall: 360 (*plate*).
Oughtred, W.: and Wren, 150.
Oulton Hall, 199.
Oxburgh Hall: brickwork, 350.
Oxenbrigge chapel, 18.
Oxford: Hawksmoor's work at, 204-208; Inigo Jones and, 99, 112; Wren at, 149, 150; his buildings, 152, 153; amateurs at, 208-211; conservatism at, 339; Gothic tradition at, 144; woodwork, 330.
—— Botanical Gardens, gateways, 110.
—— Colleges, 30; roofs, 323; stairs, 75.
—— Schools, 56-58; the tower, 55 (*illus.*), 56.
—— Town Hall, 243.
—— University: Inigo Jones and plays, 99.
—— *See* the various colleges and buildings.
Oxfordshire: influence of material in, 334.

Padua, John of, 18, 42.
Paganino, "Master Pageny," 9.
Page, Sir Gregory: house, 216 (*plate*), 217.
"Pageny, Master," 9.
Pain, James and William, 317, 318.
Paine, James: life and works, 254-259; "Plans," etc., 299; and publication of designs, 313, 318, 319; and planning, 290; and Fonthill, 288; and Kedleston, 273; and Wardour Castle, 288; Taylor and Adam, 260.
Paintings: Hampton Court, 7.
Pall Mall, Dr. Heberden's house in: plan (*illus.*), 299.
Palladian architecture: English knowledge of, 213, 214; Kent and, 232; basis of design in the eighteenth century, 250.
—— bridge at Wilton, 229, 260.
Palladianism: Inigo Jones and, 84, 104, 276, 401; Lord Burlington and, 397.
Palladio, Andrea, "Fabbriche antiche designate da," 213, 311; Leoni's translation, 228, 302; Richards's translation of Book I., 302, 303; Ware's translation, 242; Dean Aldrich's notes on, 210; Inigo Jones's annotated copy, 104; "Drawings for Roman Thermæ," reprinted 229.

Palladio designs: Almerigo's villa, 221; Lord Burlington and, 225, 226, 311; Campbell and, 221-225; Hawksmoor and, 208; Inigo Jones and, 284, 285; for L. Mocenigo, 290; for stairs, 284, *note;* rules for foundations, 92; rules for height of rooms, 298.
—— accepted authority, 305; and architectural literature, 302; compared with German designers, 35; influence after Wren, 187; Court of Common Council and, 251.
"Palladio, the British," by W. and J. Pain, 318.
Palmer: "Perlustration of Great Yarmouth," 344.
Panel: over door, Canterbury (*illus.*), 25; Christchurch, Hants. (2 *illus.*), 11, 323; Hampton Court, 323; Montacute House, 40; the Vyne (*illus.*), 1; Wilton (*illus.*), 117.
Pantheon: Fréart and, 303.
Papworth, Joseph, plasterer, 377.
—— Wyatt, on the architect, 27, *note;* and Holdenby, 44; and Thorpe, 50.
"Parentalia": and Hampton Court, 178; and St. Paul's, 168, 169; and Wren's father, 149.
Parham: gallery, 80; lead vases, 381, 384 (*illus.*).
Paris: house for Queen Mother, 45; M. Davaux's house, 304; Thorpe's work in, 50; Wren studies in, 153.
Park Lane: the Adams and, 273; Lord Petrie's house, 258.
Parliament, Houses of: Ripley and Kent's plans, 223.
Parma, Academy of: Dance junr. and, 269.
Partridge, the London smith, 173.
Passenham Church, 136.
Pastons, the: and Caister Castle, 349.
Patrick, the blacksmith, 38.
Pattern books: Abel and, 64; increase of, 86; use of, 315.
Pavilions in Parks, 241.
Peacham's "Gentleman's Exercise," 51.
Peake, Robert, bookseller, 88, 90, 116.
"Pell Records," 44.
Pembroke, Earl of, 31.
—— Philip, 1st Earl of: and Wilton, 116.
—— William, Earl of: and Inigo Jones, 98, 104; and the masques at Court, 100.
Pembroke, Lord: as an amateur architect, 229.
—— Lady: and Wilton, 263.
—— College: Wren and, 152.
Penacchi, Girolamo. *See* Trevigi.
Penni, Luca, 7, 15.
Penshurst: lead vases at, 381.
Peover, Lower, Church, 134.
Pepys, Samuel, on Nonesuch Palace, 17.
Pergolesi: plaster work, 376.
Perkins's "Italian Sculptors," 10.
Perpendicular churches of Norfolk and Suffolk, 321.
Perrault: "Treatise of the Five Orders," translated by James, 216, 309; Wren and, 402.
Peshall's, Sir John, edition of Wood, 56, 77.
Peterhouse: chapel and cloisters, 139, 140; niche, 139 (*illus.*); and Wren's father, 149; Sir J. Burrough and, 211.
Peters, painter, 213.
Petrie, Lord: and Paine, 256-258.
Phelips, Sir Thomas, 73.
Philander: Shute's extracts from, 86.
Phillimore, Miss: "Life of Wren," 164, 166, 167, 172.
Philipps, carpenter, 240.
Picart: engravings for Leoni's Alberti, 310.
Piccadilly: lead yard, 383; Lord Melbourne's houses, 264.
Pindar, Sir Paul: house, 327.
Piranesi: Carcere d'Invenzione, 272.
Planning, 67-88; in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, 276-301, 241; by Paine, 258; Wotton on, 92, 94.
Plan and elevation from Soane Collection (*illus.*), 87.
Plans: architectural, very elementary, 27, 29, 30; Thornton College, second storey, 81; Wollaton Hall, 85; Wymbledon, 83. *See also* separate buildings.
Plaster architects, the, 403.
—— and stucco: introduction and use, 360-377.
—— work: originally Italian, 23; coloured and modelled, 81, 82.
Pliny's villas: Castell on, 311.
Plumbers' work, 377-383.
Plumptre: house at Nottingham, 218.
Pocock, Thomas, jurat of Rye, 356.
Pocock's School, Rye: brickwork, 356.

Pope, the (1713): and W. Kent, 230.
Pope, William: rules as to roofs, 303.
Porch: Weobley (*illus.*), 61; West Woodhay (*illus.*), 114; Thorpe Hall (*illus.*), 127.
Portland Place: the Adams and, 272, 273.
Portland stone, 240; and Bath stone, 248; use of, 334.
Pouget: and old Montague House, 182; plans, etc., by, 304.
Poundisford Park: lead cistern, 380.
Powis, Lord: and Newcastle House, 191.
Powtram, Maximilian: monument of Elizabeth, 38.
Pozzi: "Rules and Examples of Perspective," translated by James, 216, 309.
Preston, George: and Cartmel Church, 141.
Price, builder: and St. George's, Yarmouth, 344-347.
Prichard, mason, 213.
Pricke, Robert: architectural works and translations, 304.
Primaticcio: stucco work, 362.
Primatt, Stephen, 300.
Prior, Matthew: Gibbs's design for house, 296.
Prior Park, Bath, 248 (*plate*), 249, 250.
Probus Church, tower of, 134.
Prynne and Peterhouse, 140.
Pugin and East Barsham, 350; Britton and Pugin. *See* Britton.
Pulpits, Jacobean, still existing, 136.

Quadrangular plan, 69-72, 277, 278, 292.
Quarendon Church, 134.
Queen's College, Cambridge: brickwork, 348; gallery, 80; Sir J. Burrough and the old hall, 211; ironwork, 392; compared with Haddon Hall, 70, *note*; Walnut Tree Court, 60.
Queen's College, Oxford: entrance (*illus.*), 205; south quadrangle, 206; *plate*, 208; Hawksmoor, Wren and, 200; Wren's design for library, 173.
"Queen's Head" Inn: long galleries, 75.
Queen's House, Greenwich. *See* Greenwich.
Queen's Square, Bath: and Wood, 248.
Queen Street, Great: Webb and, 123.
Queensberry, Duke of: stairs in house of, 284, *note*; house in Burlington Gardens, 228.

Radcliffe Library, 239-241; *plate*, 240; plaster spandrel (*illus.*), 375; Hawksmoor's and Gibbs's designs, 206; Gibbs's book upon, 313.
Ragdale old hall, 54.
Rain-water heads, lead, 380, 381-383 (*illus.*).
Rainham: Lord Townsend's house at: ceilings, 230, 370, 372; plan, 278; rubbed brickwork, 356, 362.
Ramsbury, 130.
Raynham Park, 118, 119 (*illus.*).
Redesdale, Lord Chancellor: and Gandon, 269.
Redland Court, 249.
Regent's Park: architecture of, 318.
Register Office, Cambridge, 239.
Revett, Stuart and: "Antiquities of Athens." *See* Stuart.
Reynolds, Sir Joshua: and Vanbrugh, 197, 198, 286.
Rice, Garraway: on Huntingdon Shaw, 387.
Ricciavelli, Leonardo, stucco worker, 362.
Richards, Godfrey: translation of "Palladio," Book I., 302, 303.
Richardson, G.: continuation of "Vitruvius Britannicus," 307; publications, 317.
Richmond, Countess of, Torrigiano's monument, 8, *note*, 10.
—— picture gallery for Prince Henry, 39; Inigo Jones and, 99.
—— Bridge: Paine and, 258.
—— Park, 50, 259, 264.
Ridge, Richard, carver, 23.
Ripley: life and works, 222, 223; and Greenwich Hospital, 182; and Houghton, 220, 313; and Lord Burlington, 233; and Flitcroft, 242, 244; and Kent, 230.
Rivius's book on architecture, 88.
Robinson, player: at Basing House, 116.
Robinson: on Italians and stucco work, 362; on frieze at Hardwicke, 364.
Rodes, Francis: and Barlborough Hall, 76.
Roehampton: Mr. Cary's house, 214.
Rolls Chapel: terra-cotta tomb, 4.
Rolls House: Campbell and, 218, 222.
Rolvenden: half-timber house, 325 (*illus.*), 326.
"Roma, L'Antichiti di," 307.
Roman Architecture: R. Adam and, 275; Chambers on, 316, 317.

Roman baths : Palladio's restorations of, 311.
Romano, Luca, stucco worker, 362.
Rome, Academy of St. Luke's : Dance junr. and, 269.
Romsey : damage to monuments, 135.
Roof : Exeter College Hall, 327 ; hammer-beam, 322-324 ; pyramidal, 360.
Rookby Hall : Ware's plates of, 242, 313.
—— Park : Wakefield and, 200.
Rooms, rules for proportions of, 298, 300.
Rose, plasterer : stucco work, 377.
Rosenberg Palace : and Inigo Jones, 98.
Ross, Thomas : and Moor Park, 228.
Rothwell market house, 45, 48.
Royal Academy : Chambers and, 263 ; Dance junr. and, 270 ; Gandon and, 268 ; Paine and, 259.
———— Library : lead work, 378.
Royal Crescent, Bath, 249.
—— Exchange, the (*plate*), 34 ; Tite and, 187 ; Jerman and, 187, 188.
—— Library, Cambridge, 239.
—— Palace, old (Somerset House), 264.
—— Society, The : Wren and its foundation, 150.
Rovezzano, Benedetto da, 11-15.
Rubens, 82.
Rudland, Robert : windows in Wadham Chapel, 34.
Rudolfi, De : and stucco work, 362.
Rushton Manor : and Thorpe, 45, 48, 72 ; triangular lodge, 45, 77 ; *illus.*, 46, 47.
Rutherford, Dr. : and Westminster dormitory, 226.
Rycott, 137.
—— Church, 142.
Rye Church, 133, 334 (*plate*).
—— East Street : brickwork, 351.
—— Pocock's School, 356, 357 (*illus.*).
Rysbrack, sculptor, 240.

Sackville, Sir Richard : and Buckhurst, 43.
—— College : lead cistern, 380.
Saffron Walden : plaster work, 369, 370 (*illus.*).
St. Albans, 134, 135.
—— Wood Street, 106, 139.
St. Alphege, Greenwich, 203, 216.
St. Andrew's, Holborn, 161.
—— Plymouth, 146.
—— by the Wardrobe, 160, 161, 236.
St. Anne's, Limehouse, 203.
St. Antholin's, 160.
St. Bartholomew's, Smithfield : quadrangle, 241.
St. Bartholomew the Less, 272.
St. Basil's, 156.
St. Bavon, Church of, Ghent, 14.
St. Benet's, Upper Thames Street (*illus.*), 165.
St. Benet Fink, 156, 158, 160.
St. Bennet, Paul's Wharf, 121.
St. Botolph, Aldgate, 251.
St. Bride's, Fleet Street, 160, 162, 163 (*illus.*), 167 ; steeple, 204.
St. Catherine Cree : arcades, 236 ; clerestory windows, 146 ; Inigo Jones and, 106, 110, 112 ; and Laud, 112, 138, 139.
St. Catherine's Hall, Camb., contract for, 28, 29 ; Essex and, 212.
St. Charles the Martyr : ceiling, 372.
St. Clement Danes, 160 ; Gibbs's addition, 235 ; Gibbs's plates of, 312 ; as model, 344 ; east arch, 374.
St. Cross, near Winchester, panels, 21.
St. Donat's Castle, terra-cotta bust at, 4.
St. Dunstan in the East, 164 ; repairs, 139.
St. Edmund's, Lombard Street, 158.
St. Fagan's Castle : lead cistern, 380.
St. George's, Bloomsbury : portico, 203, 264, 216.
—— -in-the-East, 203.
—— Hanover Square, 216.
—— Great Yarmouth, 344-347, 345 (*illus.*).
—— Hospital, 243.
St. Giles-in-the-Fields, 203, 246.
St. Gilles : west front, 399, 400.
St. Gregory's Church, 114, 116.
St. James's : Flitcroft and, 244.
—— Piccadilly, 236.
—— Westminster, 161.
—— Palace, commenced by Henry VIII., 26.
—— Square : Sir W. Wynne's house, 273, 275.
—— Street : plaster work in, 376.
St. John, Oliver : and Thorpe Hall, 125.
St. John's, Hampstead, 246.
—— Leeds, 136-138, 136 (*plate*).
—— Westminster, 214, 216.

St. John's College, Cambridge, 60 (*plate*); brickwork at entrance, 351; contract for, 29; Essex and, 212; gables, 352; gallery, 80; the library, 137; rain-water head (*illus.*), 380.
—— College, Oxford: and Inigo Jones, 98, 110, 112; and Laud, 138, 139; gate of gardens (*plate*), 38; rain-water head, 380.
—— Hospital, Bath: and Wood, 248.
St. Laurence Jewry: Wren's design, 156.
St. Katherine's, Cambridge: west front, 344.
St. Leonard's, Shoreditch, 251, 252, 253 (*illus.*).
St. Luke's, Old Street, 251.
—— Hospital, 270, 272.
St. Margaret Pattens, 162.
St. Margaret's, King's Lynn, 194.
St. Magnus, London Bridge, 161, 162.
St. Martin's-in-the-Fields: Gibbs and, 235-238, 242, 312; detail of west end (*illus.*), 237; ceiling, 376; and St. Giles's, 246.
—— Ludgate Hill, 162, 163.
—— Lane Academy: and Paine, 254.
St. Mary Abchurch, 160.
—— Aldermary, 161, 164.
—— -le-Bow, 161, 162; steeple, 204.
—— -le-Strand: Gibbs and, 234-236, 312; elevation (*illus.*), 235.
—— Magdalene's, Old Fish Street, 204.
—— Oxford: Sir James Burrough and, 211; porch, 110, 112 (*plate*).
—— Somerset, 158.
—— Twickenham, 216.
—— Woolnoth, 202.
—— Hall: side window of chapel, 146.
St. Matthias, Bethnal Green, 251.
St. Michael's, Cornhill, 164, 186.
—— Queenhithe, 158, 204.
St. Mildred's, Bread Street, 160; ceiling, 374.
St. Nicholas' Chapel, King's Lynn, 194; altar-piece, 194.
—— Cole Abbey, 158.
—— Cornhill, 161.
St. Olave's, Hart Street: rebuilt, 139.
—— Tooley Street, 246.
St. Paul's Cathedral: Wren and, 155; plans and rebuilding, 164-172; west elevation (*plate*), 166; plan (*plate*), 168; interior (*plates*), 168-170; Wren's rejected design (*plate*), 170, 204; Wren and the single
St. Paul's Cathedral—*continued.*
order, 206; Wren's design for the surroundings, 176; James and Jennings and, 216; ironwork, 387, 390; windows, 34; funds for repairs, 134; Commissioners of, and Wren, 184, 185.
—— Cathedrals, money spent on the three, 122.
—— old: and Inigo Jones, 112-114; Wren and, 153, 154.
—— Covent Garden, 110; probable design for (*plate*), 112.
—— Hammersmith, 138.
St. Peter's: and St. Paul's, 170.
—— Cornhill, 161.
—— Covent Garden: gate, 392.
—— Vere Street, 238.
—— Oxford, 77.
—— Wolverhampton: gallery, 134.
St. Philip's, Birmingham: Archer and, 214-216; tower (*illus.*), 215.
St. Stephen's, Walbrook, 158-160; interior (*illus.*), 159; font (*illus.*), 171; its ornament, 185.
St. Swithin's, Cannon Street, 160.
St. Trophimus at Arles: gateway, 399, 400.
Salisbury chorister's school (*illus.*), 359.
—— Cathedral: Hertford monument in Lady Chapel, 38 (*plate*); Wren and, 178; and Notre Dame, 400.
—— Countess of: chantry, Christchurch (*plates*), 18, 20.
Salisbury, Earl of, 44.
Salkeld, Lancelot, Dean of Carlisle, 393.
Sancroft: and Inigo Jones, 164.
Sandbach Church: additions, 136.
Sanders, joiner, 213.
Sanderson: and Kirtlington, 260.
Sandwich: brickwork, 351; step gable, 352; gatehouse (*illus.*), 337; foreign traders settled in, 32.
Sandys, Lord, 21.
Savorgnano, Mario, 79.
Saxe-Weimar, Duke of: on plaster work at Nonesuch, 362.
Scamozzi: works, 213; extracts from, translated by Leybourne, 305; Fréart and, 303; Inigo Jones and, 105.
Scarsdale, Lord: and Kedleston, 256.
Scawen, Thomas: and Carshalton, 228.

Scenery for masques: by Inigo Jones, 99, 101 (*illus.*), 102, 103, 104.
Schuym, Joachim, engraver, 305.
Scoles, J. J.: additions to Prior Park, 249.
Scott, the parliamentarian: and Lambeth Great Hall, 324.
Scott, Sir Gilbert: and chapel of Exeter College, 58.
—— Dr.: and Westminster dormitory, 226.
Screen, Abbey Dore church (*plate*), 60; Exeter College hall, 327; Gardiner's chantry (*illus.*), 20; King's, 21; Winchester choir, 21.
Screens: Jacobean, still existing, 136; St. Paul's, 170, 172.
Scudamore, John, Viscount: and Abbey Dore, 63, 64.
Sculptor and mason, 321.
Seaton-Delaval, 199.
Senate House, the, Cambridge, 238, 239; elevation and interior (2 *plates*), 238.
Serlby House, 256, 259.
Serlio, Sebastian: Shute's extracts from, 86; translation of his five books, 88; works, 213; studied by Inigo Jones, 105; Fréart and, 303.
Servandoni: and Mr. Wyndham's house, 260.
Shaftesbury House, 106, 116.
Shardeloe, 273.
Shaw, Henry: reprints Gidde's "Booke of Sundry Draughts," 90.
—— Huntingdon: and ironwork at Hampton Court and St. Paul's, 172, 387.
—— House: brickwork, 352; details of entrance, 40: H-plan, 74.
Shawfield, 218.
Sheen: Inigo Jones and works at, 99.
Shelburne House, 273, 274.
Sheldonian Theatre, 152.
Sherborne Abbey: gates (*illus.*), 391, 392.
Shers, John, purchases statues at Venice for Burghley (house), 31.
Shirley, James: "Triumph of Peace," 100, 103.
Shrewsbury: half-timber houses in, 325, 326; rain-water head (*illus.*), 381.
—— Earl of: and the Duke of Buckingham, 294.
Shropshire: half-timber style of, 60-66.
Shrubland Hall, 259.
Shurburne, Bishop: monument, 19.
Shute, John: "First and Chief Grounds of Architecture," 86, 88; and Longleat, 18.
Shutz, Christopher: authorized to search for mines, 33.
Sidney-Sussex College, 58, 60; compared with Elizabethan manor house, 70, *note*.
Simons, Ralph: life and works, 58-60.
—— and Wigge: and St. John's, Camb., 80.
Singleton, 74, 326, *note*.
Sion House: remodelled by Adam, 273, 274; designs published, 318.
Sirrigatti's "Practice of Perspective," translated by Ware, 242.
Sissinghurst: house at (*illus.*), 326.
Small Hythe: brick chapel, 351.
Smarden, Kent: a spur at (*illus.*), 324.
Smirke: and Gunnersbury, 130.
Smith, "an artificer of London," 146.
—— of Warwick, mason, 240.
Smith's, the, art, 384-392.
Smithells, 325, *note*.
Smithson, Huntingdon: works, 53, 54.
—— Robert: works, 52, 53; and Wollaton, 50, 51.
Snoring Rectory, Great: terra-cotta work, 5.
Soane Museum: collection of drawings, 42-53, 190; plans, 67-87; drawings of Greenwich Hospital, 182.
Society of Artists, Incorporated: Paine president, 259.
—— of Arts building, 273.
Solar, the, and the withdrawing room, 276.
Somerset, 64, 400.
—— Protector, 30, 31, 32.
—— House, old, 18, 30; drawings for, 42; designs for additions, 115; designs published, 314; details (*plate*), 116; elevation (*plate*), 115; chapel, 115; Chambers and, 264-268, 266 (*plate*); lead work, 378.
—— Street: Ware and, 244.
Somersetshire masons at Wadham, 321; ceilings in, 365.
South Audley Street: Ware and, 244.
South Kensington Museum: Hampton Court gates at, 172, 387; lead cistern at, 380; "mortuary" chests at, 22.
South Wingfield Manor House, 69.
South Wraxall: ceilings, 366.
Southampton Street: lead cisterns, 380.

Spang: statuary, 247.
Sparrow's house, Ipswich, 327, 328 (*illus.*); plaster work, 367, 372.
Specifications, practice with regard to, 28, 29.
Speed's map of England, 17.
Speke Hall, 325, *note.*
Spencer House, 246 (*plate*), 247, 248.
Spicer, John, 145.
Spur, the, or angle post, 324 (*illus.*), 325.
Stafford, Sir Humphrey: and Kirby, 43.
Stage, arrangement of, by Inigo Jones, 102.
Stahlmann, C. F., 98.
Staines, Sir William: and St. Bride's, 162, *note.*
Staircase: Ashburnham, 121; Christ Church, 146; Hawkhurst (*illus.*), 93; Whitecross Street (*illus.*), 91; Wye College (*illus.*), 89, 78, 82, 84, 243, 258, 276, 278, 284, 285, 297-298, 332.
Stamford, 31.
Standlynch, 249, 250.
Stanley Palace, 325, *note.*
Stanstead: plaster work, 367 (*illus.*), 369.
Stanway: gatehouse, 72.
Stapleton Park, 259.
Star Chamber, new, 100, 106.
Star Inn, Yarmouth: ceilings (*illus.*), 365, 366.
State Papers. *See* Calendar of.
Steelyard, the, 32.
Steeples: Gibbs on, 238; of Wren's churches, 156, 161-164.
Stevens, Richard: Sussex monument at Boreham, 38.
Stibington, manor house of, 128.
Stockeld, 256.
Stockton, Wilts.: ceiling, 363 (*illus.*), 365; masonry, 337; plaster work, 372.
Stoke Park, 120 (*plate*); plan, 190, 285, 286; temple (*plate*), 230.
Stone, Bath: first used in London, 241; and Portland, 248.
Stone, Nicholas: gateways by, 110; and Inigo Jones, 116.
Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, 260.
"Stonehenge Restored" by Inigo Jones, 98, 121, 124.
Stourhead, 218.
Stow: and Venice glasses, 33.
Stowe: temples in gardens, 230, 241.
Stratford Place: the Adams and, 273.
Stratton Park, 260, 270.
Strongs, the, chief masons of St. Paul's, 170, 342.
Strype's "Survey," 139.
Stuart, 182, 262.
Stuart and Revett: "Antiquities of Athens," 262, 302; R. Adam and, 275; Chambers and, 317, 318.
Stucco and plaster: introduction and use, 360-377; R. Adam and, 273, 275; Fitzroy Square, 273.
Styles, Benjamin: and Moor Park, 228.
Sudbury: Flemings at, 348.
Suffolk: brickwork, 350, 352; gables, 352; plaster work, 367, 369.
—— churches: frescoes and screens, 321.
—— Duchess of: Thorpe's survey of her land, 50.
—— Lady: house at Twickenham, 259.
—— Thos., Earl of: and Audley End, 49.
Sundials on stone column, Caius Coll., 36.
Sunningwell Church, 134.
Sussex, Radcliffe, Earl of: monument at Boreham, 38.
Sutton's monument in old Charterhouse Chapel, 39.
Sutton Place, 69; brickwork, 350; terra-cotta, 5, 21.
Swallowfield, 196.
Sweden, King of: and Chambers, 263.
Switzer, Stephen, 213; on garden design, 309.
Sydenham, 54; ceiling, 372; staircase, 82.
Symbolical plans, 77.
Symmes, John: and Great Hall, Trinity College, Camb., 29, 30.
Symmons, Ralph: and St. John's College, Camb., 29; and Great Hall, Trinity College, Camb., 29.

Tabley, 261.
Talman, William: life and works, 194-197; designs, 178, 184, 308; house planning, 292; and Tijou, 387; Vanbrugh succeeds, 198; and Wren, 187.
Tanfelde, Sir Laurence: tomb in Burford Church, 38, 385.
Tanfield Hall: casino at, 263, 264.
Tangiers: Wren and fortifications, 150.

Tanlay in Burgundy, 304.
Tapestry: Wolsey and, 7; at Hardwick, 82.
Taylor: "Old Halls of Lancashire and Cheshire," 74; classification of Wren's churches, 156.
—— Sir Robert: life and works, 260.
Taylorian institution at Oxford, 261.
Teddington Church: Flitcroft inscription, 244.
Temple, the, Wren and, 172.
—— Bar: two drawings for, 115; Wren and, 172.
—— in the gardens at Stowe, 230.
Temples or casinos in parks, etc., 241, 263, 264.
Tenterden: doorway at (*plate*), 34.
Terra-cotta, 3-6; use, 19, 350, 352; disuse, 361; Great Snoring Rectory (*illus.*), 349; busts, Hampton Court, 3, 4; plaque (*illus.*), 6; roundel (*plate*), 2.
Thanet, Earl of: and Shaftesbury House, 116.
—— Isle of: foreign settlements in, 32.
Theobalds: signs of the zodiac on ceiling, 81; lead cisterns, 378; survey, 50.
Thomas, Blomfield and: "History of the Formal Garden in England," 229, 308, 383.
Thompson, George, mason: and Peterhouse, 139.
Thoresby House, 196; section (*plate*), 194; top-lit hall, 297; inner court, 292.
Thorndon Hall; Paine's designs, 256-258; plan, 257 (*illus.*), 258, *plate*.
Thornhill, Sir James: Campbell and, 218; and Greenwich Hospital, 181; painting of St. Paul's, 170.
Thornton College: plan of second storey (*illus.*), 81.
Thorpe Hall: and Webb, 125; ceiling, 372; entrance porch (*illus.*), 127; stables (*illus.*), 129.
Thorpe, John: life and works, 31, 36, 44-52.
Thynne, Sir John, 18.
Tijou, Jean, smith, 172; life and works, 386-392; "Nouveau Livre de Desseins," 172; and Hampton Court, 172, 178, 386, 387.
Tilney, Lord, 264.
Timber and half-timber buildings, 60-66, 321-332.
Tite: design for the Royal Exchange 187.
Tixall: gatehouse, 72.
Tombstone, Dorchester (*illus.*), 347.
Top-lighting of staircases, 258, 297, 298.
Torrigiano ("Peter Torrysany"), 8, 9, 10, 401; terra-cotta work, 4.
Toto. *See* Nunziata.
Tower, the: Ware and, 243.
—— of the schools, Oxford, 55 (*illus.*), 56.
Towers of Wren's churches, 156, 161-164.
Towneley, Nicholas: and Hampton Court, 3.
Townsend, Aurelian: masques by, 103.
—— W., mason of Oxford, 240.
—— junior, stone-carver, 240.
Tracery, 144, 146, 147.
Trades connected with architecture, 320, 347.
Transactions of R. I. B. A., 15.
Treasury buildings, 230.
Tresham's, Sir Thomas, buildings, 40; and Thorpe, 45, 48, 50; and triangular lodge at Rushton, 78; Wotton and, 92.
Trevigi, Gerome da, 15, 16.
Triangular lodge at Rushton, 45, 46 (*illus.*), 47 (*illus.*), 77.
Trinity Almshouses, 184.
Trinity College, Camb.: Simons and, 58, 60; Essex and, 212; Bishop's Hostel, 358; chapel windows, 34; Neville's Court (*plate*), 174; additions, 29.
—— College Hall, 29, 30; Sir J. Burrough and, 211, 212; Essex and, 212; lead figures in garden, 383.
—— College Library: Wren's designs for, 173; plan and elevation (*plate*), 176; details (*plate*), 176.
—— College, Dublin: alterations by Chambers, 264.
—— College, Oxford: Wren and the inner court, 153; chapel (*plate*), 154.
—— House Almshouses: brickwork, 358.
Troisrieux, Dominique, 31.
Turner, John: and King's Lynn Custom House, 192.
Tuscany, Grand Duke of: and palace at Winchester, 174.
Twickenham: church and house, 216; Gibbs and house, 241; Lady Suffolk's house, 259.
Tyttenhanger: use of brick and stone, 358.

Umberslade Hall, 216.
University Chapel: windows, 34.
Uraniberg, castle of, 48.
Urn, Hampstead Marshall (*illus.*), 404.
Urns, lead, 381, 383, 384 (*illus.*).

Van Ling, Bernard and Abraham, windows by, 34.
Van Nost, John: lead yard in Piccadilly, 383.
Vanbrugh, Giles, 197.
—— John: life and works, 197-200; and Audley End, 50; and Greenwich Hospital, 181; and Grimsthorpe, 292; and designing, 173, 221, 286-288; designs, 285, 308; and height of galleries, 300; and Archer, 214; and Hawksmoor, 187, 202, 206-208; Kent and, 232; Paine and, 239; succeeded by Ripley, 223.
Vardy, John: life and works, 242, 247, 248; and the Horse Guards, 231; "Some designs by Mr. Inigo Jones and Mr. W. Kent," 231, 314; and Inigo Jones, 252.
Varro, villas described by, 311.
Vasari: on Bandinelli, 11; B. di Nardo da Majano, 12; on Nunziata, 16; on Rovezzano, 14, 15; on Torrigiano, 10, 11; on Trevigi, 16.
Vases, lead, 381, 383, 384 (*illus.*).
Venalinni, Jacob, glassworker, 33.
Venetian glass makers in London, and Edward VI., 33.
—— Republic and the English kings, 22.
—— Senate and Wolsey, 7.
—— State Papers. *See* Browne.
Venice and England, 25, 26.
—— statues of twelve emperors bought for Burghley (house), 31.
Verona, Jacopo da, 11.
Verrio, 82.
Vertue, Robert, mason, 9.
Vertue: and Inigo Jones's visit to Italy, 97; and Marsh, 131.
"Vetusta Monumenta": and East Barsham, 350.
Vicenza, villa at, 225.
Vignola: works of, 213; Fréart and, 303; studied by Inigo Jones, 105.
"Villas of the Ancients," 229, 311.
Viola: Fréart and, 303.
Vitruvius: works of, 213; translated, 25; Shute's translations from, 86; translated into German, 88; Dean Aldrich's notes on, 210.
"Vitruvius Britannicus," 120, 187, 196, 202, 214, 231, 243, 247, 248, 281, 285-288, 290-292, 307.
Vosbergh, Casper: and Stamford, 31.
Vriese, De: "Architectura" *plate* from, 36; pattern book, 35, 50; treatises, 88.
Vulp, Vincent, 15.
Vyne, the: Webb and, 124; doorway (*illus.*), 125; mantelpiece (*illus.*), 126; Italian carvers and, 21; panel (*illus.*), 1; brickwork, 350; lead tank, 380.

Waade, Armigall, 33.
Wadham Chapel: designer, 27, 28; windows, 34; and Arnold, 58, *note;* and Holt, 58; Wren at, 149, 150; and the Gothic tradition, 144.
Wakefield William: life and works, 200; and Duncombe Park, 288, 289; Paine and, 259.
Wakehurst, 339.
Walker, Humphrey, founder, 9.
Wallingford, High Street: use of brick and stone in, 360.
—— Town Hall, 346 (*illus.*), 347.
Walloon silk weavers at Sandwich, 351.
Wallop and Henry VIII., 81.
Walpole, Horace: "Anecdotes," 131, 132; on Lord Burlington, 221, 223, 311; on Gerbier, 132; on Kent, 221, 229, 230; on W. Kent, 229; and Lord Pembroke, 229; and Ripley, 223; on Talman, 196; and Thorpe, 42, 43; and Vanbrugh, 197; and Webb, 123; on Wynne, 188; and Holkham, 313; on Wolterton House, 223; "Essay on Gardens," "Beauties of Stowe," 229.
Walton Bridge, 258.
Wanstead: Campbell's designs, 220, 246; *plate*, 218; *illus.*, 219; Kent and, 230.
Warborough Church, 147.
Warde, Robert, mason at Burghley, 31.
Wardour House, 258, 259, 260 (*plate*).
Ware, Isaac: life and works, 242-245, 313-315; "Complete Body of Architecture," 250; "plans, elevations," etc., 220, 250; Pain and, 317; Paine and, 120, 250, 259, 310, 370, 402.

Ware, Isaac: and Fourdrinier, reproductions of Palladio's Roman baths, 311.
Warwick, Earl of, 43.
—— Gibbs's monuments at, 242.
—— County Hall, 260.
Water-Eaton, 137.
Watson, Edward: and lead for Somerset House, 378.
Webb, John: life and works, 123-131; plaster work, 371, 372; designs in "Vitruvius Britannicus," 308; and Whitehall drawings, 107, 108, 312; and Amesbury, Brympton, Cobham, Durham, 120; Great Queen Street, 356; and Greenwich Hospital, 181, 314; and portico of old St. Paul's 113; and Stoke Park, 190; and Wilton, 39, 117, 118, 123; and Inigo Jones, 120-128; and Inigo Jones's "Stonehenge," 98, 99, 302; and Wren, 129, 149, 152.
Welland Church, 147.
Welldon, stone from, 28.
Wentworth House: Carr and, 261; Flitcroft and, 246, 313; gallery, 261, 300, 301.
Weobley: market hall, 60-62; porch (*illus.*), 61, 62.
West's, Bishop, Chapel: ceiling (*plate*), 20; iron gates, 384; plaster work, 364.
West Drayton: plaster work, 367.
West Woodhay: rubbed brickwork at, 356, 362.
Westminster Abbey: monuments, 38, 242; Hawksmoor and, 208; Wren and, 164.
—— dormitory, 225-228, 241; Wren's design (*illus.*), 227.
—— Law Courts, 223, 247.
Westley, John: and Cambridge, 28, 60, 67.
Weston tomb at Winchester, 112.
—— Sir Richard: and brickwork, 350.
Westwood: gatehouse, 72.
Weymouth, Lord: Inigo Jones and, 110.
Whitecross Street: ceiling to house in, 366 (*illus.*), 367; staircase in (*illus.*), 91.
Whitehall, 26; Inigo Jones's designs for, 106-109; door (*illus.*), 107; Kent's reproduction of designs, 107, 311, 312; part elevation (*plates*), 106; the Banqueting House (*plate*), 108; details (*plate*), 108; gateways by Holbein, 19; ground plan (*plate*), 108; plan of first and second floors (*plates*), 110; and Kent and Vardy, 247; and St. Magnus, 162.
Whitehall: Lord Gower's houses in, 264.
—— Lord Herbert's house, *222*.
"White Hart" Inn: long galleries, 75.
White's Club, 273.
Whitt, Giles de: chimney-pieces at Cobham 39.
Wigge, Gilbert, 29, 60, 80.
Wilbury, 218.
Wildeman, John, brazier, 378.
Wilderness Park, 270.
Wilkins, 120, 239.
Willesley: introduction of chimney-stacks at, 354.
William III.: and Hampton Court, 178, 196, 339, 340, 358.
Williams, priest surveyor: and Hampton Court, 3.
—— Charles, plasterer, 364.
Willins, E.: "Some Old Halls," etc., 350.
Willis, Professor: and origin of long gallery, 79; and quadrangular collegiate plan, 70, *note*.
—— and Clarke: "Architectural History of the University of Cambridge," 28, 34, 36, 173; and Trinity Hall, 212; on Sir James Burrough, 211; on Wren's father, 149.
Willoughby: Chambers designs Casino for, 264.
—— Sir Francis: and Wollaton, 52.
Wilton: designs for, by De Caux and Inigo Jones, 39, 116-120; Webb and, 117, 118, 123; entrance archway, 263; centre bay at (*plate*), 118; Palladian bridge at, 229, 260; chimney-piece at (*plate*), 116; front burnt down, 39; gateway or garden house, 18, 19; double cube room, 198; great room, 284, 258; temple or casino, 263.
—— view of Lincoln's Inn Fields at, 106.
Wiltshire: ceilings, 365; masonry, 337.
Wimbledon: Sir T. Cecil's house, 42; plan of house, 83.
—— House: designed by Morris, 259.
—— House, Old: galleries, 80.
Winchester: use of brick and stone at, 360.
Winchester Cathedral: choir screen, 20, 116; Hawksmoor and Wren and, 200; screen to Gardiner's Chantry (*illus.*), 20.
—— College and Wren, 174.
—— Royal Palace at, 174, 175; episcopal palace of Wolvesey at, 174.

Winde, Captain. *See* Wynne.
Windsor Castle: brickwork, 352; lead fountain, 378; Ware and, 243.
Winstanley: view of Audley End, 50.
Witham, 273.
Woburn Abbey, 246, 247; *plate*, 290; plan (*illus.*), 291, 292.
Wollaton: and Thorpe, 42, 43; Smithson and Thorpe, 35, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 109.
Wollaton Hall: plan (*illus.*), 85.
Wolsey, Cardinal: and Christchurch, 70; and Hampton Court, 3, 7, 322, 377, 378, 394; tomb, 12-14.
Wolterton House, 223.
Wolterton Manor House, East Barsham, 350.
Wolvesey: episcopal palace of, 174; chapel (*illus.*), 174.
Wood, "Palmyra": publications, 318.
—— Anthony: "Athenæ," 77.
—— John, and Son: life and works, 242, 248-250.
—— T.: and the Ashmolean, 152, *note*.
Woodroffe: woodwork at Cambridge, 330.
Woodhay, West: porch at (*illus.*), 114, 115, 116.
Woolfe and Gandon: "Vitruvius Britannicus," IV. and V., 120, 213, 217, 254, 307.
Worcester College Library: designs and drawings and plans at, 115, 116, 120, 121, 292; Inigo Jones's drawings in, 100, 105, 106, 107; I. Jones's MS., 310; I. Jones's Palladio, 104, 284, *note*.
Worksop Manor House, 256; section (*plate*), 254.
Worstead: Flemings at, 348.
Wotton House: use of brick and stone, 358 (*plate*).
Wotton, Henry: on Rivius's translation of "Vitruvius," 88; Elements of Architecture, 90-95, 302.
Wraxhall, South, 36, 37 (*illus.*).
Wren, Dean, father of Sir Christopher, 149.
Wren, Sir Christopher: life and works, 149-186; "Parentalia," 106; influence on English art, 397; and English tradition, 402; and French influence, 187; plan and elevation (*plate*), 186; plan (*illus.*), 282; and house planning, 292, 293 (*illus.*), 295; drawings, 282; plan (*illus.*), 282; plan for rebuilding London (*plate*), 154;
Wren, Sir Christopher—*continued.*
and Queen's House, Greenwich, 115; and Marlborough House, 304; designs for St. Paul's (*plates*), 170; and the Westminster dormitory, 225, 226; design (*illus.*), 227; use of brickwork, 357-362; and the masons, 342; plaster work, 372, 374; and Portland stone, 248; woodwork, 128, 332; and training of workmen, 213, 214; and Archer, 215; Campbell and, 218, 308; and Dance, 251, 252; and Flitcroft, 246; and Gerbier, 132; and Gibbs, 233-241; and Hawksmoor, 200, 202; and Inigo Jones, 108, 118, 132; Talman and, 196; and Tijou, 386; Vanbrugh succeeds him at Greenwich, 199; and Webb, 130.
Wren, Matthew, Bishop of Ely, 149, 152; and the building of churches, 136; and Peterhouse, 139.
Wrest Park: pavilion at Long Water, 214.
Wright: and Royal Library, Cambridge, 239.
—— S.: and Morris, 260.
Wrotham: brick house at, 45.
—— Park: Ware and, 243.
Wurtemberg, Frederic, Duke of: and lead fountain at Windsor Castle, 378.
Wyatt, Digby, 15; and Chatsworth, 196, *note;* and terra-cotta, 5.
Wyatt James: and Wilton, 117.
Wye College: staircase (*illus.*), 89.
Wykeham, William of, 311.
Wykeham's buildings, New College, Oxford, 69.
Wyndham, Thomas: house at Hammersmith, 259, 260.
Wynne (or Winde), Captain William: life and works, 188-192; plans, 285, 286, 294; designs in "Vitruvius Britannicus," 308; and Buckingham House, 149; and Gerbier, 132; and Wren, 187.
Wynne, Sir Watkyn: house, 273, 275.
Wyvenhoe: plaster work, 367.

Yarmouth, Great: St. George's Chapel, 344-347, 345 (*illus.*); hospital for fisherman, 333 (*illus.*), 347; ceilings in the Star Inn, 365 (*illus.*), 366.
Ymber, Laurence, carver, 9.
York Assembly Rooms: Lord Burlington and, 226.

York County Court House: designed by Carr, 261.
—— Stairs water-gate, 110, 132.
—— Duke of: and Wren's design for St. Paul's, 166, 168.
York's, Duke of, Palace, 297, 298; section (*plate*), 298.
Yorkshire: buildings, 334, 336, 338; top-lit halls, 297; and masonry, 60.
Young, John, tomb of, 4, 8.

Zodiac, signs of, on ceiling at Theobalds, 81.
Zucchi, Ant., 82, 319, 377.

CHISWICK PRESS:—CHARLES WHITTINGHAM AND CO.
TOOKS COURT, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

00064336

Digitized with financial assistance from
Observer Research Foundation
on 22 February, 2019